THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVII, No. 2 AUGUST, 1957

CONTENTS

Some Further Elucidations on the Content of the *Sacram Communionem* ..... *Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani* 73

The Apparitions of Our Lady at Lourdes *Marion A. Habig, O.F.M.* 75

The Moral Value of Altruism ..*Francis J. McGarrigle, S.J.* 90

Pope Pius XII's Definition of Liturgy...*Edward J. Gratsch* 96

"Situation Ethics" or the "New Morality" *Paul H. Besanceney, S.J.* 100

Blessed Contardo Ferrini: Model of Virtue and Scholarship *Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.* 105

An Ecumenicist Viewpoint on the Church's *Magisterium* *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 113

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Joseph Clifford Fenton

A Chaplain and his Critic 127

The Suppressed Octave of *Corpus Christi* 130

The Proper Preface 130

Recitation of Prayers Before Mass 131

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Number of Candles Required 132
Nylon Surplices 132
Dedication of a Church 133
Attendance at Billy Graham's Services 133
An Inheritance for Masses 134
Holy Communion for the Nurse 134

BOOK REVIEWS

Pio XI Visto da Vicino, *by Carlo Confalonieri* 136
The Catholic Priest in the Modern World, *by J. A. Magner* 137
A Woman of Unity, *by Sister Mary Celine* 139
Mental Health in Childhood, *by Charles L. C. Burns* 141
Sobriety and Beyond, *by John Doe* 143
Sobriety Without End, *by John Doe* 143

REPRINTED by popular demand!

HUMAN EVOLUTION—1956

with APPENDIX

THE PRESENT CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS EVOLUTION

by J. Franklin Ewing, S.J., Ph.D.

A reprint from the Oct. 1956 issue of

ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Father Ewing is Professor of Physical Anthropology at Fordham. This authoritative article should be of particular interest to *all Catholic Students and Educators.*

52 pages, 5 figures

Single copy	$1.00
In lots of 5	.90 ea.
In lots of 10	.80 ea.
In lots of 25	.70 ea.

Prices Postpaid

Yearly subscription to the ***Quarterly***—$3.00

ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

The Catholic University of America Press

Washington 17, D. C.

SOME FURTHER ELUCIDATIONS ON THE CONTENT OF THE *SACRAM COMMUNIONEM*[1]

Since the promulgation of the Motu proprio *Sacram Communionem,* the following questions have been submitted to the Holy Office or to Ordinaries, or examined in periodicals:

(1) Can Holy Communion be distributed, according to the norm of canon 867, § 4, during the hours after midday, even outside of Mass?

The answer is that rule 15 of the Holy Office Instruction attached to the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* remains in force, since the Motu proprio contains no clause abrogating this rule and since, on this point, the new regulations are not incompatible with the legislation of the *Christus Dominus.* According to rule 15: "The faithful . . . may freely receive Holy Communion at this [evening] Mass or immediately before it or immediately after it."

The rule of canon 821, § 1, has not been rescinded. Hence it cannot be said that Mass can be celebrated *ex iure* during the hours after midday.

The Ordinaries, and only the local Ordinaries, to the exclusion of Vicars General not possessing a special mandate, can permit the celebration of Mass during the hours after midday for the good of a notable number of the faithful.

[1] *Editor's note:* The June, 1957, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* published the text and the English translation of the Motu proprio *Sacram Communionem.* In that same issue, under the heading "An Historic Document," there also appeared a translation of an article by His Eminence Cardinal Ottaviani, Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office. The original text of this article was first published in the *Osservatore Romano,* in the issue and on the page where the text of the *Sacrem Communionem* itself was first printed.

The Cardinal's original *Osservatore Romano* article was carried in the new periodical *Studi Cattolici.* In this Italian theological publication, however, it concluded with the material of this paper. Cardinal Ottaviani has graciously consented to the translation and the publication of this material in *AER.*

Likewise, the spirit of the concessions that have been made tends to favor the assistance of the faithful at the Mass itself. This purpose could be frustrated if Holy Communion were to be distributed at any hour at all and in response to any sort of request.

(2) Can a solid, like a caramel, which is dissolved in the mouth before it is swallowed, be considered as a liquid [in terms of the pertinent legislation of the *Sacram Communionem*]?

The answer is that it cannot. The "liquid" spoken of in the *Sacram Communionem* must be a liquid before it enters the mouth.

(3) Can the celebrant use wine for the ablutions in his first Mass when his second Mass is to be celebrated not less than three hours after the first Mass?

Since now both rules [those of the rubrics and of the *Sacram Communionem*] can be obeyed together, the priest who is going to celebrate his second Mass not less than three hours after his first Mass not only can but ought to use both water and wine in his ablutions, as the rubrics prescribe.

ALFREDO CARDINAL OTTAVIANI

THE APPARITIONS OF OUR LADY AT LOURDES

Few facts of history have been subjected to such critical examination as the eighteen apparitions of Our Lady Immaculate to St. Bernadette Soubirous at Lourdes in 1858. And yet in many books which have been written on the subject, we find inaccuracies concerning details of the individual apparitions. Many will agree that it will be a worth-while contribution on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the apparitions of Lourdes to point out the errors made by some writers and to present a correct calendar of the eighteenth appearances of Our Lady which occurred from February 11 to July 16 inclusively in the year 1858.

All the apparitions took place at the grotto of Massabielle or Massabieille, past which flowed the Gave River, formerly considerably closer than now. The grotto lay some distance from the old town of Lourdes. Situated in the southernmost part of France, Lourdes is almost twice as far away from Paris in a straight line (more than four hundred miles) as it is from Madrid. It lies on the northern side of the Pyrenees Mountains, which rise to a height of ten thousand feet and form a natural barrier between France and Spain. The Gave River, coming down from the mountains, at one place falls in a thin white ribbon for a drop of 1350 feet, and continues its course through Lourdes and past the grotto. In the old part of the town, on top of a steep rocky eminence one hundred and twenty-five feet high, stands an ancient castle which was held successively by Romans, Vandals, Goths, and Saracens. The latter were overcome by Charlemagne; and on this occasion, according to an old chronicle, the Saracen chief, whose name was Mirat, together with his soldiers, embraced Christianity and dedicated the castle to Our Lady. At the time of the apparitions, Lourdes was a station on a railway line which ran from Bayonne and Biarritz on the coast to Toulouse. Formerly at least the people of Lourdes spoke a patois of their own; and when Our Lady addressed Bernadette, she used that dialect.

Bernadette, the daughter of an impoverished miller of Lourdes, was born on January 7, 1844, the oldest of a family of six; and hence she was fourteen years old when Our Lady appeared to her. She was then already in poor health, suffering from asthma. Eight years after the apparitions, in 1866, she joined the Sisters of Notre Dame de Nevers. At Nevers, which is situated in the center of France, she died in 1879 at the age of thirty-five. In 1925 she was beatified by Pope Pius XI; and the same pope canonized her on the feast of the Immaculate Conception in 1933.

In the natural niche to the right of the grotto of Massabielle, where Our Lady appeared to Bernadette, stands the marble statue fashioned by the sculptor Fabisch according to the descriptions of Bernadette. When Bernadette saw the statue she said: "It is beautiful, but it is not she; oh no! The difference is as great as that between Heaven and earth." The walls of the grotto are now hung with a forest of crutches, votive offerings of those who were cured. Before the grotto stands a pyramid of constantly burning candles. From the spring in the grotto, uncovered by Bernadette at the bidding of Our Lady, the water is led to a series of hydrants and the triple bath house to the left of the grotto for the use of pilgrims. On the hill of the grotto, sixty feet high, and into it has been built the triple basilica, first the middle church or crypt in 1865, then the upper church in 1876 on top of the hill, and lastly the lower church or Rosary Basilica in 1883-1889 below and partially in front of the upper structures. Two ramps lead around the Rosary Basilica to the upper churches. In front of the Rosary Basilica, on a level with the grotto which is on the right side, there is a vast plaza or esplanade where the crowds of pilgrims can gather and where the processions are held. At the grotto and on the plaza the spirit of recollection and prayer prevails almost as much as in the churches; and here no religious articles are sold. Daily there are two public processions from the grotto to the Rosary Basilica: in the afternoon the Blessed Sacrament procession during which the sick are blessed individually; and in the evening the candle-light procession. Near the upper churches there is a special chapel with twenty-four confessionals. And on the adjoining higher hill, there is an outdoor Way of the Cross. So much by way of introduction. We shall first list the eighteen apparitions of Our Lady and then discuss each one briefly.

CALENDAR OF THE
EIGHTEEN APPARITIONS OF OUR LADY
AT LOURDES IN 1858

First Apparition:	February 11, Thursday before Ash-Wednesday
Second Apparition:	February 14, Quinquagesima Sunday
Third Apparition:	February 18, Thursday after Ash-Wednesday
Fourth Apparition:	February 19, Friday
Fifth Apparition:	February 20, Saturday
Sixth Apparition:	February 21, First Sunday in Lent
Seventh Apparition:	February 23, Tuesday
Eighth Apparition:	February 24, Wednesday
Ninth Apparition:	February 25, Thursday
Tenth Apparition:	February 27, Saturday
Eleventh Apparition:	February 28, Second Sunday in Lent
Twelfth Apparition:	March 1, Monday
Thirteenth Apparition:	March 2, Tuesday
Fourteenth Apparition:	March 3, Wednesday
Fifteenth Apparition:	March 4, Thursday
Sixteenth Apparition:	March 25, Thursday before Palm Sunday
Seventeenth Apparition:	April 5, Easter Monday
Eighteenth Apparition:	July 16, Friday

FIRST APPARITION

One of the earliest historians of Lourdes, Henri Lasserre, whose work appeared in 1869[1] and was honored by a letter of Pope Pius IX, erroneously says (p. 32) that February 11, 1858, the day of the first apparition, was Shrove Tuesday; and he adds (p. 45) that the next two days were Wednesday and Thursday. However, he correctly, though inconsistently, refers to the 14th as Sunday. The fact is that in 1858 February 11 was the Thursday before Ash Wednesday.

On this day, after eleven o'clock had struck, the three girls, Bernadette Soubirous, her sister Marie, and Jeanne Abadie, left the old town of Lourdes in order to gather fagots. At the grotto of Massabielle, Marie and Jeanne waded barefooted across a shallow

[1] We have used the eleventh edition of the English translation, *Our Lady of Lourdes,* published in New York in 1914, by P. J. Kenedy. The author himself was cured of hyperaemia of the optic nerve by the use of Lourdes water, as he related in another book, *Miraculous Events at Lourdes* (Baltimore: John Murphy and Company, 1884).

channel coming from a nearby mill; but Bernadette, because of her delicate health, remained behind. It was about 12:30 P.M. First Bernadette heard a strange sound as of a stormy wind, though there was no movement in the trees and bushes. Looking towards the grotto, she saw a rosebush move, then a shimmering golden cloud, brighter yet softer than the sun; and in the midst of it appeared Our Lady, who smiled and beckoned to Bernadette to come closer. Our Lady, as Bernadette described her, appeared as a maiden of sixteen or seventeen, wearing a white robe with a blue sash and a white veil which reached almost to the feet. Her feet were bare but covered partly by the dress and partly by yellow roses. On her right arm hung a large rosary of white beads on a golden chain. Bernadette fell on her knees and began to recite the rosary. Our Lady made the sign of the cross with Bernadette and let the beads of her rosary pass through her fingers; but, of course, she did not pray along except at the Gloria Patri. Otherwise she did not say a word. The apparition lasted about fifteen minutes, as long as it took Bernadette to pray the five decades. Afterwards Bernadette told her companions what had happened, and thus the news of the apparition was made known.

SECOND APPARITION

On Quinquagesima Sunday, February 14, Our Lady appeared to Bernadette for the second time. On the previous Friday and Saturday she had not been permitted to go to the grotto. But on Sunday the same three girls and five or six others of about the same age were allowed to go there. Bernadette took along a bottle of Holy Water. She knelt down, facing the rosebush, and Our Lady appeared as before. When Bernadette sprinkled Holy Water at her, Our Lady bowed her head and smiled. Bernadette fell into an ecstasy, which lasted about fifteen minutes. When Bernadette failed to respond, her companions became panicky and ran off to get help from the young miller Nicolau and his mother and to tell Mrs. Soubirous. Bernadette was taken to the miller's home, and there her ecstasy ended abruptly. There her mother found her and at first wanted to whip her, but Mrs. Nicolau dissuaded her.

THIRD APPARITION

On Thursday, February 18, which was market day in Lourdes, Bernadette was permitted to go to the grotto with two older women

of the town, Madam Millet and Antoinette Peyret. They went there early in the morning about six o'clock. At the grotto Bernadette held a lighted candle. Our Lady again appeared to her, and for the first time spoke to her; but Bernadette did not fall into an ecstasy. Bernadette offered our Lady a sheet of paper and asked her to write down her wishes. She replied: "It is not necessary that I write down what I have to say to you. Will you do me the favor of coming here every day for a fortnight? I promise to make you happy, not indeed in this world, but in the next." And referring to Bernadette's companions, she added: "They may return with you, and others too. I desire to see many persons here." Then she disappeared, and after her the luminous cloud.

The English translation of Lasserre's work (p. 56) and most of the other writers on Lourdes, for instance the more recent book of Gillett[2] (p. 205), give the wording of Our Lady's request as follows: "Will you do me the favor of coming here for fifteen days?" However, the German translation of Georges Bertrin's book[3] (p. 21) substitutes fourteen days for fifteen. The latter is the correct interpretation of Our Lady's request. The French word used is "quinzaine," which is translated by Cassell's Dictionary as "about fifteen days; a fortnight." The eighteenth was to be counted as the first day, and the fourteen days following completed the "quinzaine." We speak of an "octave" in the same way. Octave means an eight-day period including the feast which has an octave; and thus the "octave day" is the seventh day following the feast. Our Lady, therefore, asked Bernadette to come to the grotto for fourteen successive additional days. She did not say that she would appear on each of these days, as some authors would have us believe. The fact is that she did not appear on two of the next fourteen days.

FOURTH APPARITION

Accompanied by her mother and aunt, Bernadette set out for the grotto at daybreak on Friday, February 19. Our Lady appeared

[2] H. M. Gillet, *Famous Shrines of Our Lady* (Westminster, Maryland: The Carroll Press, 1950).

[3] Dr. Bertrin, *Histoire critique des événements de Lourdes: Apparitions, Guerisons,* published in 1904. This book was honored by a letter from St. Pius X. The German translation used is by Dr. Cron, *Historisch-kritische Darstellung der Erscheinungen und Heilungen,* sixth enlarged and revised edition (Strassbourg: F. X. Le Roux, 1907).

to her, and she fell into an ecstasy, a smile of heavenly happiness and joy lighting up her face. It was noticed that she made the sign of the cross in a deliberate and solemn way; and she continued to do this for the rest of her life. As she explained afterwards, "I was making the sign of the cross too fast; I had to go slower to keep time with the Lady." About a hundred persons were present on this occasion.

FIFTH APPARITION

On Saturday morning about 6:30, February 20, Our Lady appeared to Bernadette for the fifth time. Bernadette fell into an ecstasy, but Our Lady did not give her any message. This time, both her mother and her father were present, as well as four to five hundred other persons.

SIXTH APPARITION

Several thousand persons were present when Our Lady appeared to Bernadette early in the morning on February 21, the First Sunday in Lent. In an ecstatic state, Bernadette prayed her rosary, which she held in her left hand, while in her right hand she held a burning candle. Among those present was Dr. Dozous, who was not a believer at that time. He has left the following description:

> As soon as Bernadette arrived at the grotto, she fell upon her knees, took a rosary out of her pocket, and began to pray. As all those who stood nearby could see, her face soon underwent a change, indicating that she had entered into communion with her apparition. While permitting her beads to slip through the fingers of her left hand, she held in her right a burning candle which was often extinguished by the breeze which was blowing along the Gave; but each time she immediately held out her candle to the person standing next to her that it might be relighted. Since I was observing her every movement with close attention for the purpose of studying her in every regard, I desired to ascertain at this moment in what state the circulation of her blood and her breathing was. I took her arm and felt her pulse. It was even and regular. There was no sign in the girl of nervous excitement which might have an extraordinary influence upon her organism. After I released her arm, Bernadette moved a little closer to the grotto. Soon I saw that her countenance, which till now had been expressive of the most perfect happiness, darkened. Two tears rolled down her cheeks. I was surprised at these changes of expression in her face; and

after she had completed her prayer and the mysterious being had disappeared, I asked her what had happened during that long period. She replied: "The Lady turned her gaze away from me for a moment and sadly looked out over me far into the distance. Then she turned back to me; and in reply to my inquiry as to what saddened her, she said: 'Pray for the poor sinners; pray for the sick world!' The mildness and kindness that shone in her face gave me the assurance that I would be permitted to see her again. Then she disappeared." Bernadette then left the place, where a deeply impressed crowd had gathered; and she conducted herself as simply and modestly as always, without paying any heed to the people's storm of applause.[4]

The following day, Monday, February 22, Bernadette returned to the grotto, followed by two gendarmes; but to her great disappointment, Our Lady did not appear to her. The free thinkers of Lourdes mockingly remarked: "The Lady is afraid of the gendarmes. After the police commissioner Jacomet got busy, she probably thought it wise to leave that grotto without delay and to look for another place in which to stay." And they thought it was a good joke.

SEVENTH APPARITION

On Tuesday morning, February 23, Our Lady again appeared to Bernadette; and this time she confided to the girl a secret, the first of three. What this and the subsequent secrets were has never been made known. Our Lady exacted from Bernadette the promise that she would not tell anyone, and Bernadette kept that promise. Then Our Lady gave Bernadette a commission. "Go to the priests," she said, "and tell them to erect a chapel here in my honor." When Bernadette told the Abbé Peyramale later that day, he instructed the girl to ask the Lady to cause the wild rosebush at the grotto to blossom (in February) and he would regard that as a sign. Incidentally, Lasserre presents a much more favorable picture of the abbé than that which is usually found in books on Lourdes.

EIGHTH APPARITION

The next day, February 24, Wednesday, when Our Lady appeared to Bernadette and the girl presented the abbé's request, she

[4] Dr. Dozous, *La grotte de Lourdes* (Paris: Guerin-Müller), quoted by Bertrin-Cron, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 f.

merely smiled but said nothing. She did not grant the abbé's request, but would give a sign of her own choice, not on this day, but on the next. Afterwards Our Lady bade Bernadette again to pray for sinners, and to come up closer to the grotto; and then she cried out: "Penance! Penance! Penance!" According to Gillett (p. 206), Bernadette then turned to the crowd and repeated the word "Penance!" three times. That is not quite correct. Bernadette merely said the word "Penance!" three times as she dragged herself on her knees as far as the bottom of the grotto, a distance of about forty-five feet; and only those who were near her heard her say the words. There Our Lady imparted to her the second secret, and then she disappeared.

Present at this apparition was a government official by the name of J. B. Estrade. He was one of those who had made fun of the whole affair, and he had seconded Jacomet's efforts to dissuade Bernadette from going to the grotto. But on this day he had accompanied his sister and some friends of hers to the grotto. There he was profoundly impressed and began to have an entirely different view of the matter, as he himself wrote in a book which was published in 1899.[5] In that work he described the eighth apparition in detail from the point of view of a spectator. He writes:

I reached the spot, much disposed to examine and, to tell the truth, to laugh and enjoy myself thoroughly, expecting as I did, to see a kind of farce or some grotesque absurdities. An immense crowd of people massed themselves by degrees round those wild rocks. I wondered at the simplicity of so many blockheads and smiled to myself at the credulity of a crowd of devotees who were kneeling sanctimoniously in front of the rocks. We had come very early in the morning, and thanks to my skill in elbowing the crowd, I had no great difficulty in securing a place in the front ranks. At the usual hour, towards sunrise, Bernadette arrived. I was near to her. I remarked in her childish features that expression of sweatness, innocence, and profound tranquality with which I had been struck some days previously at the residence of the commissioner. She knelt down in a perfectly natural manner, without ostentation or embarrassment, and paying apparently little attention to the crowd which surrounded her, precisely as if she had been alone in a church or in a solitary wood, far from human gaze. She drew out her rosary and began to pray. Shortly afterwards her

[5] J. B. Estrade, *Les Apparitions de Lourdes: Souvenirs d'un temoin* (Tours, 1899).

look seemed to receive and reflect a strange unknown light; it became fixed and rested wondering, ravished, and radiant with happiness on the opening in the rock. I turned my eyes in the same direction, but I saw nothing, absolutely nothing, except the naked branches of the wild rosebush. And yet, must I confess it to you? In face of the transfiguration of the child, all my former prejudices, all my philosophical objections, all my preconceived negations fell at once to the ground and cleared the way for an extraordinary feeling which took possession of me in spite of myself. I had the certitude, the irresistible intuition that a mysterious being was there. My eyes did not see it; but my soul and the souls of the innumerable witnesses of this solemn hour saw it as I did, with the inner light of evidence.[6]

Bertrin (p. 27) quotes some excerpts from Estrade's testimony but erroneously says he was present at the seventh instead of the eighth apparition.

NINTH APPARITION

On Thursday, February 25, Our Lady imparted to Bernadette the third and last secret. After a short period of silence, she said to the girl: "And now go and drink from and wash yourself in the fountain, and eat of the herb which is growing at its side." Since the Gave, a few steps away, was the only water she saw in that place, she started to turn towards the river; but Our Lady pointed to a spot within the grotto, on the right side as you face it. Crawling on her knees to the spot indicated, Bernadette began to scratch the ground with her hands and scooped out a little hole. As she did so, the soil became damp and then muddy. After three futile attempts, she succeeded the fourth time in swallowing some of the mud and then smeared her face with it. She also ate a piece of the wild plant growing there. Some of the spectators thought the girl had gone mad. The scene is graphically described by Werfel (pp. 229-234).[7]

Only afterwards did they learn that Bernadette had uncovered a spring at Our Lady's bidding. At first it merely seeped through the ground, then welled up in a tiny stream and gradually increased in volume until a few days later it was a jet of limpid water having

[6] Lasserre, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 f.

[7] Franz Werfel, *The Song of Bernadette*, translated by Ludwig Lewisohn (New York: The Viking Press, 1942).

the size of a child's arm. From that time to the present day, the spring has produced a constant flow of water, totalling 25,000 to 27,000 gallons daily. The water is channeled to fifteen hydrants and nine baths, and the spring easily supplies a sufficient amount for all of them. Even though it may be a natural spring which was merely discovered by Bernadette, it is a miraculous one inasmuch as Our Lady told her where it was hidden and in many instances has endowed the water of the spring with supernatural healing power. The first miracle was the healing of Louis Bouriette, whose right eye had been injured internally some twenty years before by an explosion at a quarry, and who could see things only as through a mist. A few days after the ninth apparition, he bathed his right eye with water from the new spring, and gradually regained his eyesight completely. Doctor Dozous had to admit it was a miracle. Although chemical analyses have found no healing ingredients in the water, numberless astounding cures have been effected by its prayerful use in the course of the past century.

Gillett (p. 206) wrongly calls this ninth apparition the tenth. He (p. 207) as well as Bertrin (p. 31) are mistaken also in saying that there was an apparition on the next day, February 26, which Bertrin erroneously designates as a Wednesday. It was a Friday. Elsewhere in his book (p. 55) Bertrin himself correctly states that there was no apparition on February 26, although Bernadette went to the grotto. It was the second time during the "quinzaine" that Our Lady failed to appear.

TENTH APPARITION

Our Lady appeared for the tenth time to Bernadette on Saturday, February 27; but there was no special message. Bertrin (p. 80) wrongly calls this the eleventh apparition; and the message which he records for it (p. 31), "Tell the priests to build a church here," was given in the seventh apparition.

ELEVENTH APPARITION

On the Second Sunday of Lent, February 28, the eleventh apparition took place in the usual manner. According to Bertrin (p. 31) more than 2,000 spectators were present; but he is mistaken in calling this the twelfth apparition.

TWELFTH APPARITION

When Our Lady appeared to Bernadette on Monday, March 1, the girl had a friend's rosary in her hand, but Our Lady told her to use her own. The statement is sometimes made that no priest was present at any of the apparitions; however, at the twelfth apparition, the Abbé Dézirat, from another parish, was among the onlookers.[8]

THIRTEENTH APPARITION

On Tuesday, March 2, Our Lady again told Bernadette that she wished a chapel to be erected at the place of the apparitions, and added that a procession to the grotto should be held on the following Thursday, the last day of the "quinzaine."

FOURTEENTH APPARITION

Bernadette went to the grotto on the morning of Wednesday, March 3, but Our Lady did not appear to her then. However, when Bernadette came back late in the evening of this day, Our Lady did appear, and explained that there had been no apparition in the morning, because at that time people were present who merely wished to look at the girl's face during the visit and were unworthy of that because they had dishonored the grotto by spending the night in it. Bertrin (p. 31) is mistaken when he says that there was no apparition on this day.

FIFTEENTH APPARITION

Thursday, March 4, was the fourteenth day after February 18, the last of the successive days on which Bernadette had promised Our Lady to go to the grotto. Some 20,000 persons had gathered at the grotto on this day, some of them from distant places, including Spain. This time the gendarmes formed an escort for Bernadette and led her through the crowd to the grotto. When Our Lady appeared to Bernadette, the girl asked her for her name. So far Bernadette had not identified her heavenly visitor as the Blessed Virgin; she merely said it was a Lady of unsurpassed beauty who held a rosary. Those who regarded the visions as genuine took it for granted that it was the Queen of Heaven. How-

[8] Gillett, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

ever, the time had not yet come for Our Lady to tell Bernadette her name. Her failure to do so and the fact that she did not say goodbye led Bernadette to think that the fifteenth apparition was not to be the last. However, three weeks were to elapse before the next was to take place.

SIXTEENTH APPARITION

On the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, the Thursday before Palm Sunday, Our Lady once more appeared to Bernadette; and this time, after the girl had begged her three times to reveal her name, Our Lady answered in the local patois: "Qué soi l'Immaculada Councepcion"—"I am the Immaculate Conception!" But Bernadette did not know what the words meant. It was only afterwards, when the meaning of "Immaculate Conception" was explained to her, that she knew it was indeed the Immaculate Queen of Heaven who had favored her with her apparitions.

SEVENTEENTH APPARITION

Our Lady appeared to Bernadette for the seventeenth time on Easter Monday, April 5; and this time the girl knew it was the Mother of God. Bertrin says (p. 34) it was April 7; so does Gillett (p. 210). But if it was Easter Monday, it was the 5th. In 1858, the 7th was the Wednesday after Easter. Probably Bertrin wrongly computed the twelve days which he says (p. 55) elapsed between this and the previous apparition, by inserting twelve full days between March 25 and April 7. If one counts March 25 as the first day and April 5 as the last, there are twelve days.

At this apparition a strange thing happened, which was a plain case of the suspension of the laws of nature. Dr. Dozous was an eye-witness, and reported the occurrence in the following words:

> Bernadette was on her knees and prayed with great fervor, holding the rosary in her left hand and a burning candle in her right. As she moved in the usual way on her knees up toward the grotto, she stopped suddenly, we knew not why, brought her right hand over to her left, and held the flame of her large candle under her fingers so that it passed upwards between them. Though the flame was made bigger by a rather strong breeze, no burns seemed to appear on the skin of her fingers. Amazed by this phenomenon, I asked the others not to disturb the seeress, pulled out my watch and watched her thus for a

full quarter of an hour. After Bernadette had completed her prayer and the glow of transfiguration had left her countenance, she arose to leave the grotto. I held her back for a moment and asked her to show me her left hand. I examined it with great care, but nowhere found the least trace of a burn. Then I turned to the person who was holding Bernadette's candle and told her to relight it and hand it to me. Thereupon I held the flame of the candle several times in succession under Bernadette's left hand. Each time, she pulled it away as quickly as possible, saying: "But, sir, you are burning me!" I report the fact without comment, as I observed it with my own eyes and as very many other eyewitnesses besides myself, who were close to her, saw it.[9]

EIGHTEENTH APPARITION

More than three months later, on Friday, July 16, the feast of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Our Lady appeared once more to Bernadette. By this time the civil authorities had barricaded the grotto, and Bernadette knelt on the other side of the Gave River; but this did not prevent Our Lady from making her appearance. To Bernadette it seemed that she was as near as ever. This was the last apparition.

Three and a half years later, on January 16, 1862, after a long and minute investigation Bishop Laurence of Tarbes, made the following official declaration:

After having invoked the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, and the assistance of the Most Blessed Virgin, we have declared and do declare as follows: We pronounce judgment that the Immaculate Mary, Mother of God, really appeared to Bernadette Soubirous, on the eleventh of February, 1858, and following days, to the number of eighteen, in the Grotto of Massabielle, near the town of Lourdes; that this Apparition is invested with every character of truth, and that the faithful have good ground for believing it to be certain. We submit, with all humility, our judgment to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff, to whom is committed the government of the universal Church.[10]

On July 3, 1876, in the presence of a hundred thousand pilgrims, Monsignor Meglia, as representative of Pope Pius IX, crowned the statue of Our Lady at Lourdes. As a memorial of this event, a crowned statue of Our Lady now stands at the farther end of the

[9] Bertrin-Cron, *op. cit.*, pp. 66 f.

[10] Lasserre, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

great esplanade in a bed of flowers surrounded by an iron fence. And in 1935, when the Christian world observed the nineteenth hundredth anniversary of the Redemption of the human race, on Sunday evening, April 28, our present Holy Father, who was then still Cardinal Pacelli, delivered an eloquent address in which he said in part:

> In this place the Lady, clothed with the sun and crowned with stars, deigned to show herself to us. From here, her resplendent goodness, brighter than the sun with which she is clothed and more mellow than the stars with which she is crowned, shines out upon the world. Ah yes, the world! I know not whether it was the scene of more stormy attacks of hell ever before, whether it ever witnessed so terrible a conflict between the serpent and the Woman who crushed its head as the one of today—I do not know. But never before has the rising flood of faith and hope and charity inundated it as now. The Immaculate Virgin, the Queen of Peace, descends to earth in this secluded corner of the Pyrenees . . . for the purpose of restoring the world by a new and incomparable diffusion of the graces of our Redemption by Christ. . . . O Great God! What are the weapons! What is the password! The poor little Soubirous girl must needs cry out to this proud and pleasure-seeking world: 'Prayer! Penance! Penance! Penance!' Be still, O Bernadette, be still! We have understood. In your call, "Penance! Penance! Penance!" we recognize the echo of the one coming from the Cross, the Cross, the Cross.

During the year in which Cardinal Pacelli visited Lourdes and spoke these words (1935), more than a million pilgrims from all over the world prayed at Bernadette's grotto of Our Lady Immaculate. Records kept at Lourdes of pilgrimages during the years 1867 to 1913 show that more than six million pilgrims visited the famous shrine of Our Lady during those years. During the year 1933, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the apparitions, there were one and a half million pilgrims. During the years after the Second World War, the annual total was more than 600,000; and the number has kept on increasing, so that by 1950 the pilgrims who came in organized groups by train numbered 800,000, and many more came by road or independently. In the square before the triple basilica, Holy Mass is sometimes offered up before crowds of fifty to one hundred thousand.[11]

[11] Gillett, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

By way of conclusion to this brief study, permit me to quote a few significant words from the pen of Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson:

> The whole place is alive with Mary and the love of God—from the inadequate statue at the Grotto to the brazen garlands in the square, even as far as the illuminated castle and the rockets that burst and bang against the steady stars. If I were sick of some deadly disease, and it were revealed to me that I must die, yet none the less I should go to Lourdes; for if I should not be healed by Mary, I could at least learn how to suffer as a Christian ought. God has chosen this place—He only knows why, as He, too, alone chooses which man shall suffer and which be glad—He has chosen this place to show His power; and therefore has sent His Mother there, that we may look through her to him.[12]

MARION A. HABIG, O.F.M.

St. Louis, Mo.

[12] Monsignor Benson, *Lourdes* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1914), pp. 82 f.

THE MORAL VALUE OF ALTRUISM

The ethical value of all love of others is its real self-love. This rather startling assertion is the only possible rational norm and guide for altruism, namely, the extent to which it is true egoism. But it must be necessarily true, if the general norm and obligation of all right action is God's glory, in our perfecting of our own nature by our human actions. Social ethics concerns a part of the whole field of human action; hence, the norm of social ethics must be the same as the norm of all ethics, namely, the perfecting of one's nature as God intends for each individual. This norm and obligation is the beautifully unifying and safely guiding principle of all ethical science and action. The word "egoism" is more commonly used to mean real hate of oneself by unethical action. We mean here, by egoism, true love of self.

The perfection and welfare of society, accomplished by an individual, must be understood by him as only an intermediate end and a means to his own perfection and welfare, by which alone, man, as the image of God, can be His glory, in reflecting His perfection. Thus man directs all things "through himself and with himself and in himself" to God's glory. The better we live for others according to our circumstances, the more we live for ourselves and for God. Love of others is of value as love of ourselves, which is of value as love of God. Scholastically put:

> The purpose of man is to be a glory of God.
>
> Man can give glory to God only by perfecting his individual nature, by which he reflects God's perfection and is God's glory.
>
> Ergo, we must love others
> only inasmuch as such love perfects our own nature.

Thus I may not perfect the lives of others by injury to my own nature, that is, by moral evil. For example, I may not commit suicide to aid my poor family, by thus freeing them from the heavy expense, which my incurable sickness entails.

There are no justified purposes of man, which end in anything else but God's glory. For each person, there is no means to God's

glory, which is not also directed to our own perfection and glory; for only by one's own glory can he glorify God. Even love of complacency, by which we will a good to be what it is, without explicit advantage for us, is a good for self, in the fact that it satisfies our natural tendency to will that good *be,* either in God or in creature. For example, we love with complacency a character who has no relation to us; and in doing so, we love ourselves in thus satisfying our natural tendency of complacency in the existence of good. Even love of God must be also love of self. "Suppose," says Aquinas, "what is impossible, that God were not man's good; then man would have no reason for loving Him."

All our desire of good for itself, because it is desire, must be a seeking of good for oneself; for the definition of good is the satisfaction of desire, or tendency: "Art for art's sake" is always art for my sake. We must ever remember that our action cannot be ethical, unless it is personally ours, and unless it perfects the order of our person, as God intends for each. Man is to be freely "for himself," in imitation of God, Who is necessarily for Himself. The only way that man can truly be for himself is to be for God, and to be for others, but never in such a way that in being for others, he is not for himself, and, consequently, not for God.

When, through education and influence, I develop the character of another person, who gives God a glory far surpassing that which I give Him, *my* glory given to God thereby is the extent to which *my* person and will imitate God's Nature and Will, in *my* formation of that other person. If, with all my formation of the other, he gave little glory to God, my glory to God would be the same. We cannot glorify God by anything outside ourselves, since all human glory is given to Him by reflecting His Perfection finitely in our own perfection of nature. The perfection in other natures, even though we have been the means to it, is *their* reflection and glory to God.

We do not calculate the amount of our glory given to God, by the *result* of our actions in others, but by the result of these actions in ourselves—not because of what others do and are because of us, but because of what we do and are because of them. If I fulfill my social duties excellently towards a person, say, towards a child or pupil, who does, or does not, live a subsequent life of glory to God, equal in both cases is my glory given to God; for equal in both cases

is the perfection of my nature and will, thereby imitating the divine Nature and Will. This fact is, indeed, consoling in our inevitable failures, while it is sobering in our successes.

Man was made for self-investment in the lives of others, in order that they become more perfect human beings and greater glory to God. But whatever the outcome in others, the investment returns to us dividends, in increase of our perfection and in increase of glory to God through us. We must, indeed, spend our life for others, but so that we can save it for ourselves. In this way, "he who shall lose his life, shall find it." Man is moral in sacrificing his own good, only when by doing so, he gains a greater good for himself, and thereby is a greater glory of God.

Spinoza, Kant, Wundt and many others contend that an act is not moral, if the purpose of the act is the perfecting of oneself, and that it is moral only when it is for the perfecting of others. However, one cannot be morally perfected by perfection in others; and if, as they say, we cannot be perfected by our own actions affecting ourselves, then no one can be moral. Their assertion, moreover, which is very common, is wholly unaccompanied by proffered proof. We must remember that, Kant notwithstanding, society is not our end, but a means. Hence, "social service," by itself, cannot constitute the purpose of man—much less can it be his religion, as a great many profess it to be.

One of the many simplicisms in the ethics of extreme evolutionists, like John Dewey, is that moral actions are solely social, in the reason of their origin, in their meaning, and in their purpose. As usual, error gives itself the lie. This counter-evolutionary, all-out altruism is not what one would expect from the ground principle of evolution, without which you are not an evolutionist, in the general sense of the term. One would rather expect "the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence,"—or "nature red in tooth and claw." Upstart, shaggy evolution borrows the finery of the Natural Law, but, as an upstart, carries it into impossible exaggeration, which makes evolution appear even worse than if it had remained in its aboriginal and natural crudity.

H. A. Pritchard, professor at Oxford, an intuitionist in ethics, upsets Plato's ethical norm of happiness or advantage (lusiteléin), by showing that justice ('allótrion 'agathón), or others' good, at times may not be our own good ('óikeion 'agathón), when we under-

stand good as only earthy, and when we prescind from God. Here, however, Pritchard does not aid intelligence of the moral norm very much, when he takes refuge behind the iron curtain of irrationality, which he calls "intuition." If there should be justice as others' good, it must always be demonstrable as one's own good, which it can be only if we show it to be God's purpose and glory.

Bradley and Taylor, English ethicians, with whom Rashdall associates himself, hold that "Reason clearly pronounces that, what would otherwise be the highest good of the individual, ought to give way to the like good of others." Nevertheless, it is evident that their God-avoiding morality puts them in a quandry as to when, and how, and why they must sacrifice themselves for others. Really their principle, as it stands alone, is a piece of sheer dogmatism, with no adduced reason.

Since we can give God no glory except by perfecting ourselves, we can go to the limit of saying that there is no God-glorifying real altruism, except inasmuch as it is egoism. Strange how error skirts the truth! We can appositely, in our own ethics, use evolutionist Spencer's social conclusion which follows from his evolutionary premise of "survival of the fittest," namely, that beneficence is justified only when it is "both blessing to him that gives, and blessing to him that receives." All love is wasteful prodigality, which does not enrich self primarily, in giving to others.

On the other hand, those who, like Reinhold Niebuhr, reason from a mistaken revelation of the "total depravity of human nature" mistakenly declare that since all men's actions are selfish, all men are evil and hypocritical.

We must drastically modify Kant's "Categorial imperative," or absolute command, that we treat all human nature, whether in ourselves or in another, always as an end, never as a means. We may not make our own or another's human nature merely means to attain goods of earth beneath ourselves. We must use everything and everybody as means to our perfection, and thus to the glory of God; but the only way, in which we may use others, is by perfecting their natures. If the good of others is made our ultimate end, and not a means to higher ends, we do wrong in helping others. In making others man's supreme end, Kant fathered the brood of modern socio-moralists, who consider the good of others the absolute norm of social right and wrong, and even of all right and

wrong. Good done to others can be morally wrong, as morally evil to ourselves and against God's glory.

"Total disinterestedness," which many moralists, with no reason, cavalierly propose, is psychologically impossible; for we tend by instinct to the perfecting of others, as we tend to knowledge by instinct. When we morally perfect others, we perfect ourselves, by satisfying natural altruistic tendency, in the same way as we perfect ourselves by the satisfaction of our natural tendency for knowledge.

For a reason not meant by Socrates, who said it, "I should bear injustice rather than do it." When I do injustice, I injure myself as well as others. When I reasonably bear it rather than do it, I benefit myself in making myself a greater glory of God, as a more perfect human being.

In follows from the self-conscious personality of man, that he is the "image of God" in loving himself in all his loves of other beings. By inevitable instinct, man's nature, like God's Nature, necessitates love of himself in his every act of love of another, even of God. Man cannot realize his nature's intended perfection, except by giving himself to something greater than himself, namely, to God; and his neighbor is his chief means of giving himself to God. Hence, the profound truth of Christ's philosophy, that by losing his life for his neighbor, he loses it for God, and thus finds it for himself.

It is only God and immortality, which makes us the center and hub of all our actions, in which we, at once, give God and ourselves eternal glory. It is only God and immortality, which makes sense in the Socratic assertion that it is better to receive than to give injustice. Hence, Sidgwick holds Socrates' tenet as "an ultimate and fundamental contradiction" and "after all, illusory."

Ethics founded on true self-love makes social relations perfect; while an exclusively social ethics makes social relations a conflicting program. This, too, is the answer to Pascal protesting that "Self . . . is unjust, because it makes itself the center of all." Self is most fittingly the center of all creatures, inasmuch as the proper center of self is God's glory. We are an egocentric world, because we are a theocentric world. If we turn all our use of creatures to God's glory, we turn them all to our glory; and our purpose: *Ad majorem Dei gloriam* (to the greater glory of God) becomes also:

ad majorem mei gloriam (to the greater glory of me)—a rather Jesuitical viewpoint, but true.

The interaction of individuals reaches so intimately into the innermost recesses of our mind, our feelings, our soul, our very being, that there cannot be an individual life, which is not a manifold social life. Love of our neighbor is our social nature's command; it is God's Providence for mankind; it is our principal exterior way of realizing our love for God and for His Will. "Love of one's neighbor," which is the wishing and doing well to our fellowman, is an indispensable and chief means of perfecting ourselves. This doctrine alone will humanize society and lead man to fulfill the divine purpose for his nature.

F. J. McGarrigle, S.J.

Seattle University
Seattle, Wash.

POPE PIUS XII'S DEFINITION OF LITURGY

In his encyclical, *Mediator Dei,* Pope Pius XII defined the liturgy briefly as "the worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members."[1]

Worship is associated with the virtue of religion. The worship paid by creatures to their Creator involves a recognition and avowal of God's excellence coupled with an expression of submission and dependence.[2] Creatures pay worship to God by the performance of certain actions. Some of these actions, such as prayer and sacrifice, *of themselves* express the idea of religious worship. They are said to be *elicited* by the virtue of religion. Other actions, like fasting and almsgiving, do not directly signify religious worship, although they can be used by a religious person in the worship of God. Actions bent to the service of God in this fashion are said to be *ordered* by the virtue of religion. Speaking of actions ordered by the virtue of religion, St. James wrote: "Religion pure and undefiled before God the Father is this: to give aid to orphans and widows in their tribulation, and to keep oneself unspotted from this world."[3]

Among the actions elicited by the virtue of religion some, such as devotion and prayer, are inward acts. They are called the *interior* acts of religion. Other acts elicited by the virtue of religion, such as sacrifice or the taking of an oath, involve some aspect visible to the senses as an essential characteristic. These acts are called *exterior* acts of religion.[4]

Because of the visible nature of the Church, the Mystical Body, those actions by which the Church officially worships Almighty God must also have a visible aspect. Consequently, they must be classified as external acts of religion. While it is true that these actions may not be accompanied by religious sentiments on the part of the human minister, nevertheless these actions always retain their religious significance because of the interior sentiments of the Head of the Mystical Body, Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is present

[1] *Mediator Dei,* NCWC translation, p. 10.
[2] II^a-II^{ae}, q. 81, a. 3. ad 2; and articles 4 and 6.
[3] *James,* 1:27.
[4] II^a-II^{ae}, qq. 81-91.

in every liturgical action.[5] The Holy Father, in his encyclical, mentions those acts of worship which comprise the liturgy: the Sacrifice of the Altar, the administration of the Sacraments, the praising of God in the Divine Office by a deputed minister,[6] the performance of the ceremonies surrounding the Sacrifice and Sacraments, the use of Sacramentals and the other rites instituted by the hierarchy of the Church.[7] It is evident that all these actions enumerated by the Holy Father are visible, at least to some extent. These actions are liturgical precisely because they offer worship to God. It would seem therefore that the administration of the Sacraments—to use an example—is a liturgical action, not for the reason that such an administration is productive of grace in the soul, but for the reason that the administration of the Sacraments expresses submission to and dependence upon Almighty God.[8]

The liturgical actions by which worship is given to God are to be ascribed, first of all, to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body or Church. As man, He is the instrumental Cause of transubstantiation; by the power communicated to Him by the Most Blessed Trinity, Jesus Christ as Man is responsible for the change of bread and wine into His own Body and Blood. To view transubstantiation merely in this light is to view it merely as a singular and wonderful change without any aspect of worship. If, however, we view transubstantiation as the immolation and offering of the Divine Victim in sacrifice, we must regard Our Blessed Lord as the principal priest of the Sacrifice;[9] that is, no longer as an instrument, but in His own Name, Our Lord offers worship to God. Theologians discuss the meaning of the fact that Our Lord is the principal priest of the Mass. This fact means, at least, that Our Lord offers each Mass in the sense that He instituted the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and gave His priests the power and the command to renew the Sacrifice which has its efficacy *ex opere operato* from His merits. An increasing number of theologians explain this fact in the sense that He actually wills and offers each Sacrifice of the Mass of which He is aware through the

[5] *Mediator Dei*, p. 10.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[8] Cf. Hanssens, S.J., in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1948, I, 582-85.
[9] Cf. *Denz.*, 940.

Beatific Vision and also His infused knowledge. Obviously He intends the full sacrificial significance of recognition of God's excellence and of submission and dependence.

The administration of the Sacraments is also an action of Christ; so, for example, according to St. Paul, while the Sacrament of Baptism is administered by the human minister, it is Christ Who cleanses the Church in the bath of water by means of the word.[10] The administration of the Sacraments may be considered merely as an action productive of grace or, in certain cases, of a character in the soul; or it may be regarded as a religious rite signifying worship of God. This worship is to be attributed principally to Jesus Who offers it in the same way *servatis servandis* in which He offers worship to God through the Sacrafice of the Mass.

It is true that the Church is responsible for the adoption of the Divine Office, sacred ceremonies, Sacramentals and the other rites instituted by the hierarchy of the Church in the worship of Almighty God. Nevertheless these prayers become the prayers of Christ Himself, Who is our great Intercessor, Who has promised: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them."[11] It is apparent therefore that all liturgical actions are actions of Christ, that any lack of religious sentiment on the part of the human minister which does not destroy the validity of the liturgical action does not hinder the rendering of worship to the Father because of the worshipful influence of Christ.

Those liturgical actions, however, by which worship is given to God are to be ascribed, not only to the Head, but also to the whole Body. The human priest offers the Sacrifice of the Mass by serving as an instrument of consecration in the hands of Jesus Christ. The human priest is truly the cause of the change of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ; yet in effecting this change, he is the minister of Christ, as is apparent from the words which he uses: "This is my Body" and "This is my Blood." The human minister administers the Sacraments as an instrument of Jesus Christ. The human minister truly removes sin from the soul when he says: "I baptize you" or "I absolve you"; but he accomplishes this, not by his own power, but with a power given Him by the Saviour. By carrying out the Sacramental rites which involve

[10] Cf. *Eph.*, 5: 26.
[11] *Matt.*, 18: 20.

dependence upon and submission to Almighty God, the priest offers worship to God. The priest along with certain clerics and religious has been deputed by the Church to praise God in the Divine Office[12] or to perform the other rites of the liturgy.

It is well known that the faithful offer the Sacrifice of the Mass,[13] although in a way that differs from the way in which the priest offers the Mass. It is the priest who consecrates; the faithful do not consecrate. The faithful are sometimes said to offer the Sacrifice—and these are more extrinsic explanations—because frequently they assist at Mass by joining their prayers alternately with those of the priest, because sometimes they offer to the ministers of the altar bread and wine to be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, because by their alms they get the priest to offer the Divine Victim for their intentions. A more profound reason that the faithful are said to offer the Sacrifice is that the minister at the altar represents Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, Who offers in the name of all His members. Hence the whole Church can rightly be said to offer up the Victim through Christ.[14]

Apparently a similar doctrine is to be held concerning the worship offered to God by the faithful in the administration of the Sacraments. The faithful offer worship to God by offering the materials for the administration of the Sacraments and by responding to the minister during the rite. They offer worship by their reception of the Sacraments. They offer worship because the administration of the Sacraments as a religious rite expressing submission is accomplished principally by Christ, Who, in His capacity as Head of the Mystical Body, worships in the name of all. The faithful offer worship to God through the Divine Office and the other rites of the Church because these rites are carried out by a minister acting in the name of the members of the Church.

So it is that "the liturgy is the worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members."

EDWARD J. GRATSCH

Mt. St. Mary's Seminary
Norwood, Ohio

[12] Cf. canons 135, 610.
[13] Cf. *Mediator Dei*, pp. 33 f.
[14] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 34 f.

"SITUATION ETHICS" OR THE "NEW MORALITY"

An American psychiatrist, Dr. James G. Miller of the University of Michigan, recently made front page news by recommending that combat soldiers keep a suicide pill in their kit. In that effective way a prisoner of war could avoid giving away state secrets under pressure of torture or brain-washing. A spokesman of the Pentagon quickly turned thumbs down on the idea.

We should realize, however, that the American professor was neither original nor unique in voicing such an opinion. His voice, on this side of the Atlantic, is only the echo, as yet faint and intermittent, of an outspoken philosophy and morality which has been heard in Europe for some time now. Among the names by which it is now known are "Situation Ethics" and the "New Morality." We have known its parent doctrine by the name of Existentialism.

We ought from the start to avoid thinking of Situation Ethics as a term representing a complete or well-defined system of morality; rather, it is, in the spirit of Existentialist philosophy, a tendency to depart from natural law morality in favor of a supposedly dynamic, personalist ethics. It is a trend represented by E. Michel's approach to the problems of marriage. T. Steinbüchel is thought to have leaned in that direction too, influenced by the writings of F. Ebner, M. Buber, and S. Kierkegaard. However, Steinbüchel opposed the philosopher E. Grisebach, who is called the chief proponent of Situation Ethics.[1]

The Vicar of Christ has not been unaware of the dangers which this "New Morality" holds for the children of the Church. In 1952, twice within a month's time, and once again in the following year Pope Pius XII addressed gatherings of world organizations on this subject.[2] On February 2 of last year, the Holy Office

[1] J. Fuchs, S.J., "Morale-theologique et morale de situation," *Nouvelle revue theologique,* LXXVI (1954), 1074.

[2] A radio address to Christian educators "On Forming a Right Christian Conscience in Youth," March 23, 1952. An allocution to the World Federation of Young Catholic Women, April 19, 1952. An allocution to the Fifth International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology, April 13, 1953.

published an Instruction concerning Situation Ethics.[3] It seems, therefore, that it is a subject deserving of our attention.

Just what is this "Situation Ethics" which has been causing such a stir? We can borrow our description of it from the Holy Father himself:

> The distinctive sign of this morality is that it does not, indeed, base itself on the universal moral laws, as for example the Ten Commandments, but on the conditions or real and concrete circumstances in which one must act and according to which the individual conscience has to judge and to choose. In this state of things human activity exists. That is why the decision of conscience, says the holders of this ethics, cannot be commanded by ideas, principles, and universal laws.[4]

These principles and universal laws, they say, are concerned with the abstract being of man, *homo ut sic,* who certainly exists nowhere. They are inapplicable to real man as he exists, to *homo ut hic*—thus does Pius XII, paraphrased here from a different context, further specify the teachings of Situation Ethics.[5]

At its worst, then, this new ethics denies all validity to the natural law and to any general norm of morality. With much truth we might say that the proponents of the new morality have broken their heads on the old problem of the one and the many, the universal and the particular. They have finished by rejecting entirely the universal. For the atheistic Existentialist there remains only one individual of value, and that is the personal "I," who, in full liberty and untrammeled by any static essences, will strive to realize his complete personality in each successive situation.

So much for the extreme, atheistic form of this "moral" doctrine. However, this existentialist ethics has a special appeal also to the Protestant mentality, enamored of private interpretation and opposed to every mediator between the soul and God. E. Michel openly grants this dependence on Protestant theology; and the theme of Situation Ethics is said to appear more often now in the writings of Protestant theologians such as E. Brunner, H. Thielicke, and especially R. Hauser.[6]

The Liberal Protestant who has taken up this Situation Ethics will, to that extent, put aside general norms of morality; but,

[3] *AAS,* XLVIII (1956), 144-45.

[4] *AAS,* XLIV (1952), 414. All passages quoted in this article are translations made by the author.

[5] *Catholic Mind,* LI (1953), 430. [6] J. Fuchs, S.J., *loc cit.*

unlike the atheist, he will bring God into the picture. Again Pope Pius XII has given a clear picture of such a Christian in action:

> In the determination of conscience the single man meets God directly and makes his decision before Him, without the intervention of any law, of any authority, of any community, of any cult or creed, of anything in any way. Here there is only the "I" of the man and the "I" of the personal God; not of the God of the law but of God the Father, with whom man must unite himself in filial love . . . the right intention and the sincere response are what God considers; the action does not matter to Him at all.[7]

Although the Pope seemingly had not only the Protestant Christian in mind here, his description fits the Protestant mentality perfectly.

The Congregation of the Holy Office, however, has said that this system of ethics "is beginning to be spread even among Catholics";[8] and the Pope was no doubt concerned about this fact especially. The Catholic who follows this tendency will of course keep God in the picture of the situation, just as the Protestant does. However, he will be less inclined to deny validity to the natural law and the positive laws of God, the Church, and the State. These, he will say, have their place; but their applicability to the concrete case is limited. They are all general norms, after all; and therefore they do not exhaust the content of the individual situation, especially the irresolvable individuality of the person concretely involved.

Hence the Catholic proponent of Situation Ethics will hold that (in the words of the Instruction of the Holy Office):

> . . . the decisive and ultimate norm of action is not right objective order, determined by the law of nature and known with certitude from this law, but some inner judgment and light of the mind of each individual, by which it becomes known to one placed in a concrete situation what he should do. . . . This judgment, at least in many matters, is ultimately measured as to its objective rectitude and truth by no objective norm, placed outside man and independent of his subjective persuasion; it neither should be measured nor is it measurable, but it is fully sufficient unto itself.[9]

This internal judgment, independent of every objective norm, is evidently at the core of the doctrine which the Holy Office is prohibiting. How can we further describe this internal light? It

[7] *AAS*, XLIV (1952), 415-16. [8] *AAS*, XLVIII (1956), 144. [9] *Ibid.*

seems to be an innate habitual disposition and power by which a man is enabled to see what in the moral order is conformed to his own individual personality. This conformity with the personality of the agent is intuited by introspection. But keep in mind that we are not speaking simply of subjective guilt or innocence in an action; rather it is a question of the objective rectitude of an individual act to be placed. However, this internal judgment, which is proposed as the ultimate norm of morality for an individual act, is not itself a kind of general principle which an individual could apply to himself a second and a third time in similar cases. Each new situation will require, in its turn, a new judgment.[10]

That is the "internal light" of Situation Ethics at work. Perhaps an example will help to clarify at this point the difference between this and traditional ethics. Let us take the case of twin brothers, Amos and Andy. In a normal situation both would no doubt judge that to commit suicide is objectively wrong. However, they would judge so for different reasons—Amos because he recognizes that suicide is against the natural law, Andy because in the normal situation suicide does not befit his own personality. Now let us put Amos and Andy in a special situation. They are lying side by side in a fox hole in Korea. Their ammunition has run out, and the Reds are closing in on them. Some Dr. Miller has supplied each with a cyanide pill. After reflection, Amos throws the pill away because he realizes that suicide is still against the natural law. Andy, however, takes the pill to avoid brain-washing and the danger of divulging military secrets. His internal light tells him that this is objectively the right thing to do as a fulfillment of his own personality.

It is not impossible of course for God to speak to a man by that "inner light," dispensing him, for instance, from service in a just war in order to be a prophet of peace—but how great is the danger of illusion in this![11] A genuine private revelation of this sort would be extremely rare.

Situation Ethics is a doctrine which has actually led to the suggestion of many objectively immoral actions. Committing suicide to preserve military secrets may have an heroic glow to it, but most of its suggestions are far from heroic. It would advocate the

[10] F. Hürth, S.J., "Annotationes in Instructionem S. S. C. S. O. de Ethica Situationis," *Periodica*, XLV (1956), 158-59.

[11] J. Fuchs, S.J., *loc. cit.*, 1081.

killing of a fetus in the case where both mother and child are expected to die. It is also suggested that the whole sphere of sexual morality be re-examined under the influence of Situation Ethics. Involved in this would be the practice of birth control in some circumstances, direct masturbation for medical purposes, etc. Moral theology, they say, is in such matters outmoded and static.[12]

We ought not to deny that many a difficult situation will offer a challenge to the Christian conscience. No one can be freed from a personal responsibility to acknowledge and use the universal moral law, to exercise prudence, to follow the authentic inspirations of the Holy Spirit, and to practice as well as he can the art of the discernment of spirits.[13]

Even with all the aids that an individual may have in his grasp, it can happen of course that in involved matters he will act from an erroneous conscience—although in good faith. He must follow his certain conscience, erroneous or not. It should be clear, however, that his certain but erroneous conscience does not constitute the objective morality of the case. His act, although subjectively licit, will still be objectively immoral.

Before concluding, it will be worth while to state three maxims which the Holy Father has said are opposed to Situation Ethics:

(1) Although God primarily and always wants the good intention, this is not enough. He also wants the good work.

(2) It is not permitted to do something evil in order that good may result.

(3) There can be situations in which a man, especially a Christian, must sacrifice all, even his life, in order to save his soul. The martyrs of all times remind us of this.[14]

Finally, while distinguishing sharply between the subjectively-licit erroneous conscience and the pseudo-objective norm proposed by Situation Ethics, we must keep clearly in focus the central error prohibited by the Instruction of the Holy Office: it is not permitted to teach that there is a subjective internal light which is above all objective norms of morality and by which a person can determine for himself in any given instance what is objectively good or bad.

PAUL H. BESANCENEY, S.J.

West Baden College
West Baden, Ind.

[12] F. Hürth, S.J., *loc. cit.*, 1085-86.

[13] J. Fuchs, S.J., *loc. cit.*, 1082-84.

[14] *AAS*, XLIV (1952), 417-18.

BLESSED CONTARDO FERRINI: MODEL OF VIRTUE AND SCHOLARSHIP

"A giant in the field of law," said Pius XII; "An example given to our times," said St. Pius X; "A saint in a frock coat," said Benedict XV. Three popes have testified to the tremendous achievement of a brilliant and saintly Italian layman who died when he was only forty-three. Contardo Ferrini, beatified in 1947, was by nature unassuming, almost timid; of medium build but well proportioned, he had that ease and grace of movement that one finds in athletes. Blue eyes and a neatly trimmed beard set off an intelligent and serious face.

During his twenty years of manhood he taught Roman law at the Universities of Pavia, Messina and Modena; he wrote over two hundred works: the majority on points of law, critical editions of ancient texts, and innumerable book reviews; he gained a reputation as an authority on Roman law as yet unsurpassed. Above all, he reached a high degree of sanctity based on a sincere and wholehearted practice of his religion and fired by an intense love of God. Contardo Ferrini's life represents a vital combination of scholarship and holiness, of the active and contemplative life. He blended the different aspects of his activities in such a remarkable way, that according to Pius XII, "the professional work and the inner life were joined in an inseparable unity." If we examine the two elements in his life: his work in law, and his spiritual ideals, we can better appreciate, and perhaps imitate his life, which was in all ways "pleasing to the Father."

As a student in the latter part of the nineteenth century, Contardo Ferrini lived in turbulent times. Italy was undergoing an internal change which produced severe repercussions for the Church as well as for the individual Catholic. The universities were tainted with philosophies that denied the spirituality of man and limited his judgments to material values. For Ferrini, who was born on April 4, 1859, in Milan and received a solid training in things Catholic from his parents, this atmosphere was repulsive. After attending elementary and preparatory school in Milan, Ferrini at the age of seventeen left for the University of Pavia in 1876. As an undergraduate he encountered the young élite who were so

often bitterly opposed to the Church. Though he tried to show them their errors, and frequently attempted to explain the Christian point of view, his efforts were met with open hostility and insults.

His years at the University of Pavia (1876-1880) were unhappy ones. Extremely sensitive, he could easily be teased or embarrassed and his companions lost no time in finding ingenious ways to annoy him. Thus, once on a trip from Pavia to Milan, several of the students started singing a particularly ribald song. Ferrini froze in his seat and every muscle of his face contracted in an expression of great pain. He said nothing, but as each verse of the song progressed he alternated between blushing and turning pale. This reaction caused the singers to shout out more lustily. Before him he held a book, and though his eyes were downcast, he did not read a line. When the train reached Milan he ran to the exit with discomfort still plainly visible on his face.

Another time he entered the common room of the University and sat down at his usual place. This was the only heated room in the building and so was very popular with the students. As he sat down he saw on the table before him two copies of a daily newspaper that was arranged in such a way that its headlines spelled out an obscene word. When he noticed this, Ferrini stood up and left the room never to enter it again as long as he remained at the University.

From then on he spent all his time in his own unheated and damp room, where the cold of the northern Italian winters made him quite uncomfortable. But even here he was not safe from the pranks of his fellow students.

Undaunted by the harsh treatment he received, Ferrini managed to do exceptionally well in his studies. While at Pavia he became very interested in languages and thus was unwittingly preparing himself for his future work in law. His foremost biographer, Carlo Pellegrini, tells us that his classical, historical and linguistic preparation was excellent. He knew French, Spanish, and English very well; could write German perfectly; and had a good reading knowledge of Dutch and several German dialects. In Latin and Greek he was extremely competent; and was able to read Hebrew, Syriac, Sanscrit and Coptic. Later, when working on old manuscripts he was able to read them easily and in accord with the sound advice given him by one of his early teachers: "Trust no one however

learned; beware of them and go direct to the sources, for only then will you be sure of reading the truth."

At the age of twenty-one, in 1880, he received his Doctorate in Jurisprudence from the University of Pavia. His thesis, written in Latin, was on the legal knowledge contained in the poems of Homer and Hesiod. In treating this subject, he showed an extraordinary skill in the fields of history, law and philology. The thesis was so well received that it was honored singularly by being published by the University.

In the fall of 1880, Ferrini left for Berlin where he had won a two-year scholarship. Living at the Ursuline Hostel he no longer had to worry about his fellow students troubling him, and he had the opportunity to pray often. While there he joined an association of Catholic students and was deeply impressed with the vital spirit of Catholicism these students showed. At Berlin Ferrini matured greatly.

While at Berlin he became especially interested in the philosophic side of law. Roman law became his specialty and he also did much work on the Byzantine penal code. To many, this study of the law of ancient Rome and the examination of original sources may appear to be a dull and completely uninteresting work. But for Ferrini it was fascinating to deal with old texts and to uncover the forgotten glory of Roman law and show how it was closely related to basic Christian principles. Far from being a useless study of faded pages, it was a challenge to his ingenuity and intellectual acumen. He was not attracted to the law courts; and though his knowledge of law, both ancient and modern, was extensive, he never once tried a case.

Ferrini's contribution to the study of ancient Roman law is tremendous. A glance at the long list of his published works will evidence his ambition, skill, and unflagging zeal. Though he published much on various problems of civil law, it was his commentaries on the *Digest of Justinian* and on the *Roman Penal Law* that made his name, according to Pius XII, "celebrated in the world of scholars." His work on the *Institutes of Justinian* and on the *Basilici* are good examples of his ability. The *Basilici* were a collection of decrees dating from the ninth century and began with the canons of Basil the Macedonian. The sixty books of this collection had been lost and all hope of ever finding them has been given

up. However, in 1896 Dr. Giovanni Mercati, who is now a cardinal and head of the Vatican Library, found in Ambrosian Library at Milan an old manuscript which contained some parts of the lost *Basilici.* Written in difficult script and on poor vellum, the text made any work of editing extremely slow. Ferrini along with Mercati and Achille Ratti who later became Pius XI, worked on the manuscript and after long and painstaking labor seventeen thousand lines were deciphered and Book VII of the *Basilici* was published in 1897.

Other important works of Ferrini include *Fonti del Diritto Romano, Diritto Penale Romano,* and *Il Libro Siro-Romano tradotto del siriaco e annotato dal Ferrini* which was published after his death. His facility with languages, his persistence at research, and his acute grasp of the problems involved, made him an outstanding scholar in his chosen field.

Ferrini began teaching after he returned from Germany and his first classes were in the University of Pavia. Later he taught at the University of Messina (1887-1890), and at the University of Modena (1890-1893). In 1894 he returned to Pavia at the unanimous request of the Academic Council who were eager to have such an illustrious scholar teach there. He remained at Pavia till his death in 1902 and while there he taught Roman Law and Penal Procedure, Roman Penal Law and a course on the Institutes of Justinian.

As a professor of law Ferrini had to fit his scholarly research into a busy teaching schedule. Lectures and examinations took up much of his time, but he worked quickly and seriously and so was able to accomplish much in a short time. Severe and demanding as a professor, he was not, at first, liked by his students. In time, however, he mellowed and became a favorite. His quiet tone of voice and precision in terms and explanations made him the ideal teacher. The profound goodness of the man along with his brilliance in law was a combination that endeared him to those he taught.

Ferrini was aware that proper organization of material and mastery of presentation is essential to any teaching technique. He insisted that "Experience has taught me that in lecturing it is essential to aim at the greatest possible simplicity of expression." He avoided useless mention of obscure authorities or of minute problems. To present the fundamentals in the clearest manner possible

was his aim and everything was geared to achieve this. He encouraged questions in class and never hesitated to repeat or restate the matter. Never sarcastic or over-critical, he listened patiently to the opinions of his students.

His lectures were often the scenes of heated discussions, and Ferrini, though by nature reserved, could be articulate and even insistent when he was arguing. For him the classroom was the ideal place to combat the corrosive philosophic errors of the time and to point out their absurdities. Sincerity and deep devotion to truth characterized his whole life, and prompted Pope Pius XII to say at his beatification: "This love of truth, the genuine mark of the learned, of the scholar, was the incentive and dominant impulse of his work."

Having seen Contardo Ferrini as a scholar, we are now in a better position to consider the source of his energy, the spiritual ideals behind his actions. There were, as far as we know, no ecstasies, no mystic experiences or miracles that took place while he lived. Yet, as Pius XII so well says: "The miracle is he himself, a radiant model of every virtue for the veneration of the people." His whole life was spent in putting the Gospel message in his life by doing all things for Christ.

Basing his life on the answer to that ever-present question—"Why do I exist?"—Contardo Ferrini realized that man, though high in the order of creation, was still a finite being tending to the Infinite—to God. With this in mind, he tried to orientate all his actions to the Divine, and to sanctify every moment of his daily life. He found he could do this by a personal and intimate contact with the Holy Eucharist. By making the Eucharist the center of his life, he was able to perfect all his acts. Thus he writes: "Let us receive Holy Communion so that we can put on Christ and be transformed in Him. Receiving this sacrament the soul dies to itself and to the world and lives in Him."

Beginning every day with Mass and Holy Communion, he managed to devote at least fifteen minutes daily to mental prayer. On Sundays and holidays he would spend many hours in quiet prayer and reading. He transformed his life into a continuous act of humility and praise of God's greatness. Ferrini, following Augustine, shows how he sanctified his day of intellectual effort when he says: "Study was a colloquy with the supreme Truth, a thanks-

giving in every advance of understanding, a petition in every difficulty, and an act of humility before every obscurity."

Simplicity was the keynote in his practice of virtue. Living in a plainly furnished room he had no desire for luxuries. This simplicity which is reflected in his humility pervaded every aspect of his life. Slow to dogmatize even in matters in which he was competent, he feared he would embarrass people if he spoke with too much conviction. So great an impression did he make on one of his associates in this matter, that at the Apostolic Process, his friend testified that Ferrini "never spoke of himself either favorably or unfavorably. He never put himself forward and his exterior appearance was such that it did not give anyone the slightest suggestion of his great knowledge and virtue." Ferrini's humility was not a thing of chance; it was based on the sound theological fact that before the Infinite everything pales. One of his pupils phrased it well when he said: "Ferrini was so convinced of the smallness of man in view of the eternal, that the humility that resulted was natural and almost instinctive. He considered his vast learning as nothing."

The apostolic side of Ferrini's character must not be overlooked. As a member of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and The St. Vincent de Paul Society and later as a Franciscan Tertiary he was able to do much good work. However, for him the real apostolate was the classroom where he could fulfill that desire to serve his fellowman by encouraging him in the practice of the Faith. The love he showed to his neighbor was real and based on the principle that man is the image of God and so worthy of our love. Thus, he could say with firm conviction: "Our love for visible man is the rule by which we measure our love for the invisible God."

When we consider Contardo Ferrini as a man of prayer, a renowned scholar, and a brilliant professor, we immediately ask: Why did he not become a priest? It would seem that his gifts would have been useful in the priesthood, and most of his friends took it for granted that he would some day be a priest. Yet Contardo, though he undoubtedly gave it deep consideration, decided that he had a different vocation. In a letter to a dear friend he writes of the priesthood and says: "Perhaps if I were worthy, I

might." He knew that he was not a leader; his student days at Pavia convinced him of that. He sincerely felt that he could make better use of his talents by remaining a layman.

Scholarly research and teaching occupied most of his time, but still he managed to work in an occasional holiday. When he was still a boy, his father bought a small villa at Suna on Lake Maggiore. Here he became an expert swimmer, and acquired a lasting love for the mountains. As a mountain climber he was an expert, and was able to claim among his victories Monte Rosa, Monte Leone and the Latelhorn. The dangers and hazards he faced on the peaks were a challenge for him and he enjoyed matching his ability against the unpredictible slopes and icy paths. Even in this recreation Ferrini was able to find God. Thus he writes: "God spoke also to man in the clouds on the mountain tops, in the thunder of the mountain torrent, in the dazzling splendor of the everlasting snows."

It was at his beloved Suna with its lovely lakes and green mountains that Contardo Ferrini died on October 17, 1902. Previously affected by a weak heart and exhausted from overwork, he was unable to resist the advances of typhoid fever. Still a young man at forty-three, he died peacefully surrounded by his family and friends.

His reputation for holiness gradually spread, and numberless people came to pray at his tomb. The process of beatification was started and the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Milan became very active in promoting his cause. Scores of people were examined and their testimony weighed carefully with the certain conclusion that Contardo Ferrini had practiced heroic virtue during his life. Two miracles which are required for beatification were also substantiated. Both of the miracles had young boys for their subjects. One, Aloysius Vallentini, had a severe spinal paralysis which had progressed to the point where no hope was given of recovery. The other boy, Edward Grametti, had a serious brain concussion with repeated hemorrhages from the mouth and ears. In both of these cases medical care was of no help, and after praying to Contardo Ferrini for help, a lasting and complete cure resulted. Finally, on April 13, 1947, forty-one years after his death Contardo Ferrini was solemnly beatified by Pope Pius XII, long an admirer of his spiritual and scholarly achievements.

Blessed Contardo Ferrini was an extraordinary man—a master in the field of law, an expert in the things of the spirit. As a layman, a professor, and mountain climbing enthusiast, he was able to forge his life into a masterpiece. He was not a wonder worker nor prophet, not even a priest; yet he so transformed every element of his life that it became a thing of beauty imitating in some way the perfection of God. Contardo Ferrini was a real man not an artificial personality. He is in the words of Pope Pius XII: "a saint of our times, of the century of frenzied activity. He is a man of modern reality, but also the saint of the present hour."

PATRICK GRANFIELD, O.S.B.

St. Anselm's Priory
Washington, D. C.

AN ECUMENICIST VIEWPOINT ON THE CHURCH'S *MAGISTERIUM*

Within the past few months, English translations of two recent works by Fr. Yves M. J. Congar, the well known French intellectual leader, have appeared in the Catholic book stories of this country. Both of them should be intensely interesting to our priests and seminarians. The larger of the two is entitled *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of the Laity.* The original French work, published in 1953, is called *Jalons pour une théologie du laicat.*[1] This work can best be discussed along with other recent writings on the same general subject, and in the light of what Pope Pius XII has taught about the *theologia laicalis* in his allocution *Si diligis.*[2]

The shorter translation carries the title: *Christ, Our Lady and the Church.* It is an English version of the brochure *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* a work first published in 1952 and reissued three years later.[3] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church* has a special im-

[1] *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of the Laity,* by Yves M. J. Congar, O.P. Translated by Donald Attwater (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1957). Pp. xxxvi + 447. The French original is *Jalons pour in théologie du laicat,* published in 1953 by Les Éditions du Cerf in Paris. It is a book of 683 pages.

[2] The text and translation of *Si diligis* are to be found in *AER,* CXXXI, 2 (Aug., 1954), 127-37. See also Fenton, "The Papal Allocution *Si Diligis,*" in *AER,* CXXXI, 3 (Sept., 1954), 186-98.

[3] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church: A Study in Eirenic Theology,* by Yves M. J. Congar, O.P. Translated with an Introduction by Henry St. John, O.P. (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1956). Pp. xix + 103. The original text is *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* published by Desclée De Brouwer in Paris. It is a book of 107 pages.

Father Congar is one of the most influential writers of his own school. His most important volume in this field is still *Chrétiens désunis: Principes d'un "oecuménisme" catholique,* published in 1937 by Les Éditions du Cerf in Paris. This book was the first volume of the series *Unam sanctam.* Also ecumenicist in tone was his *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église,* published in 1950 by the same firm and listed an n. 20 in the *Unam sanctam* collection.

Father St. John has also written extensively in the ecumenicist vein. A collection of his articles appeared in book form two years ago under the title *Essays in Christian Unity: 1928-1954.* It was published by the Newman Press in Westminster, Maryland.

portance because it is a clear and thorough application of the principles of what some have called ecumenicist theology[4] to certain areas of Catholic doctrine, particularly to the teaching about the Church's *magisterium*.

Unfortunately this English translation is not at all easy to deal with. Fr. Henry St. John, the translator, states in his Preface that he "has adapted Père Congar's original to the requirements of English readers in several ways."[5] He explains that he has omitted a few allusions and references, and that he has left out some notes and reconstructed others. He calls attention to the fact that "These alterations and adaptations have all been made with the cordial concurrence of Père Congar himself."[6] He does not, however, prepare us for what we actually find: that he has inserted several passages into the text itself, and has changed, generally by softening them, some of the statements of the French original. In some sections of the work, and it must be said, in the most important parts, *Christ, Our Lady and the Church* is a paraphrase rather than a strict translation of the *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église*.

The book itself contains two rather long chapters. The first of these appeared in article form in the Nov., 1951, number of *La vie intellectuelle*. It has a definitely ecumenicist orientation. The author starts out from an observation of the fact that discussions or dialogues between Catholics and Protestants had broken down rather badly after the solemn definition of the dogma of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven. He shows that, in these discussions, both sides had taken for granted their complete agreement in the acceptance of the teachings of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon about Our Lord. He reasons that the sharply unfavorable Protestant reaction to the definition of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven is an indication that, in reality, the agreement about Our Lord had not been as complete as both sides had imagined it to be. He sets out to show that the Protestant opposition to Catholic teaching about the Church and about Our Lady

[4] The name "ecumenicist theology" is sometimes applied to books like Dr. Hanahoe's *Catholic Ecumenism: The Reunion of Christendom in Contemporary Papal Documents* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953). Works of this type contain no trace of the doctrinal and procedural shortcomings manifest in *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*.

[5] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, p. vii.

[6] *Ibid.*

is consonant with and in some way flows from the basic Protestant attitude with reference to Our Lord's own human nature. He contends that, in all of these areas, there is an unwillingness, on the part of distinctively Protestant thought, to accept the fact that a human nature or an organization can act as a real cause in the direction of eternal salvation.

Yet, when Father Congar comes to the ultimate conclusion of his first chapter, he calls for a re-examination of theological teachings by both Catholics and Protestants.

> We believe it to be both desirable and necessary for the Christian communions which hold the formula of Chalcedon as the standard of Christological truth to institute an examination of conscience as to their fidelity in guiding the development of theology by the light of its principles.[7]

The first invitation to such an "examination of conscience" is issued to the Catholics.

> It may be that Catholics should give still further consideration to our Lady and the Church, and to the place which belongs to them in relation to Christ, at the centre of the whole scheme of salvation. It may be also that some expositions of our Lady's place there show her too exclusively as endowed, in herself and on her own behalf, with unprecedented privileges; as if for instance God had willed in honouring man in Jesus Christ to honour woman in Mary. Some statements of ecclesiology perhaps treat the Church too exclusively as an institution and in doing so show it too much as if it were the source of its own sufficiency, and so richly endowed from its foundation that it has, in a certain way, the independent power of disposal of God's gracious and continual bounty.[8]

In terminating the account of the matter on which Protestants should make their own examination of conscience, *Christ, Our Lady and the Church* says that "They must in short seek to understand better that our belief about our Lady and the Church derives from the wholeness of the traditional testimony of the undivided Church concerning Christ."[9] The original French text runs: "Ils auront enfin à mieux chercher à comprendre comment ce que nous

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

disons de l'Église et de Marie tient à tout cela, qui forme l'affirmation traditionnelle de l'Église indivise sur le Christ."[10] In both renderings, an appeal to the tradition of the "undivided Church" leaves the way open to an implication that the true Church at this moment is actually divided.

Thus, in concluding the first chapter of *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* Father Congar runs true to form as a Catholic participant in an "ecumenical dialogue." Such an individual is always working towards the attainment of some measure of agreement and unity with his non-Catholic associates in the discussion. He starts towards his objective by indicating some portion of religious thought within which the non-Catholic obviously holds some position not in accord with the teaching of the Scriptures, the earlier Councils, or the Fathers of the Church. He shows that a change of position in this area on the part of his non-Catholic associates would definitely be a step in the direction of religious unity.

But, as a participant in a "dialogue," he feels that he must point out some roughly similar step which Catholics themselves must make. Quite obviously Catholics cannot possibly abandon any position contained in the body of Catholic dogma. Thus the teachings or tendencies which Catholics are invited to relinquish must be represented as current and fairly widespread abuses manifest in Catholic theology or Catholic preaching. Unless they were thus current and widespread, there would be nothing for the Catholics to relinquish.

The examples of possible objectionable Catholic positions given by Father Congar are somewhat astonishing. Certainly God intended to honor man in making the Incarnate Word a Man. And no less certainly He intended to honor woman by enriching His Blessed Mother as He did. Granted that this was not the primary intention of the Incarnation, it was still within the area of God's intention. And certainly Father Congar would find it difficult to show any Catholic manual or other work on ecclesiology which stated or even insinuated that the Church can dispose of God's gifts independently of God Himself.

In this first chapter, however, there is some highly questionable teaching about the Catholic notion of the Church. Thus we read:

[10] *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* p. 49.

The Church is seen in it [the Catholic position about the Church] as a grace-conferring organism giving effect to the work done for our salvation by our Lord in his earthly life. The fundamental claim that it makes is: to a body of teaching handed down by tradition from Christ and his apostles, safeguarded by the state of grace given to the episcopate; to sacraments as mysterious channels of the grace which flows from the Cross; to powers of priesthood inherent in the hierarchy by which both doctrine and sacraments are made effective. These together constitute the content and substance of Apostolicity.[11]

Father Congar is definitely not responsible for the worst features of this passage. The passage which Father St. John set out to translate describes the Catholic position as holding that

L'Église est un *organisme de grâce* procédant de ce que le Seigneur a fait pour notre salut dans les jours de sa chair, et comportant à titre principal: une doctrine, une tradition transmise depuis Jésus-Christ et les apôtres grâce aux charismes donnés aux évêques; des sacrements, canaux mystérieux de la grâce de la croix; les pouvoirs du sacerdoce hiérarchique correspondant et à cette doctrine et à ces sacrements, et qui forment le contenu ou la matière de l'apostolicité.[12]

The teaching contained in the passage from the French text is so inadequate as to be definitely misleading. It completely passes over the power of jurisdiction given by Our Lord to His Church militant of the New Testament, and mentions only powers which correspond to the Church's doctrine and its sacraments.[13] But it is not guilty of such ineptitudes as the statement that the Church, according to Catholic teaching, gives effect to what Our Lord did for our salvation before His ascension into heaven. Likewise, it did not say that divine apostolic tradition is "safeguarded by the state of grace given to the episcopate," or that both the doctrine

[11] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* p. 6.

[12] *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* p. 12.

[13] "To the latter [the Apostolic College] he has committed the stewardship of the two chief means of grace; the preaching of the Faith and the celebration of the Sacraments" (*Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* p. 7). These same two powers, without any reference to the Church's power of jurisdiction, again appear as quasi notes of the Church. We are told that "human beings are said to be embodied in it [the Church] wherever the Apostolic ministry of Word and Sacraments, with the promised action of the Holy Spirit, makes the conditions which constitute a community of the faithful actually effective" (*ibid.,* p. 8).

and the sacraments of the Church are made effective by powers of priesthood inherent in the hierarchy. These are the personal contribution of the translator. Unfortunately the reader of the English version encounters shortcomings introduced by both Father Congar and Father St. John.

Another serious error mars this section of *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* but here the English translation is not nearly as bad as Father Congar's own text. According to the English version: "A classical definition of the Church, widely adopted in mediaeval theology, was that the Church is the assembly, society, or community of those who possess the faith."[14] Father Congar, however, represents this definition as "classique, universellement tenue dans la théologie catholique avant le Réforme."[15]

Actually any definition of the Church as an assembly of those who *possess* the faith never has been a "classical" formula, either before or after the Reformation. The definition to which Father Congar seems to be referring is the one employed by such ecclesiologists as Moneta of Cremona and St. Thomas Aquinas, according to whom the Church is the congregation of the faithful.[16] The *fideles* mentioned in the definition were not those who possess the faith, but those who profess that faith. Canonically the *fidelis* was and is the genuine member of the Catholic Church. The formula, which pre-Reformation theologians took as equivalent to the definition *catholicorum collectio,* taken from the *Decretum* of Gratian,[17] was used as an instrument in teaching the lesson that the society composed of those who are baptized, who profess the true faith, who have access to the sacraments, and who live in harmony with and in subjection to the Roman Pontiff and the Catholic bishops, constitute Christ's true *ecclesia* of the New Testament.

The encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* made it abundantly clear that membership in the true Church is described in terms of the

[14] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* p. 7.

[15] *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* p. 13.

[16] Cf. Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses Libri Quinque* (Rome, 1743), p. 390, and St. Thomas Aquinas, *De Symbolo Apostolorum.*

[17] Cf. *Decretum Gratiani,* c. 8, D. I, "de cons." Some of the pre-Reformation definitions of the Church are discussed in Fenton, "Scholastic Definitions of the Catholic Church," Part I, in *AER,* CXI, 1 (July, 1944), 56-69.

profession rather than the possession of the true Catholic faith.[18] It would be unfortunate were some Catholics to be misled into believing that this teaching of Pope Pius XII constituted a reversal of a theological teaching that was classical and universally held in Catholic theology prior to the Reformation. The universal teaching of the theologians is always the expression of the doctrine set forth by the *ecclesia docens*. The teaching Church does not reverse its doctrine from one age to another.

The second chapter of *Christ, Our Lady and the Church* is entitled "Catholic Piety towards Christ, the Church and Our Lady: Is it always free from a Monophysite tendency?" In a work of ecumenicist theology the answer to such a question is always quite obvious. According to Father Congar Catholic piety is definitely not free from this objectionable tendency. In this chapter the most noteworthy of the tendencies which Catholics are called upon to relinquish and reverse is designated as "un certain monophysisme ecclésiologique."[19]

In the introduction to this second chapter Father Congar treads very softly indeed in speaking of the men who have manifested the tendency to which he takes exception.

> To ask this question ["Is the Monophysite heresy still a possibility?"] concerning writers who live or have lived, thought, and written from within the Church, and whom the Church itself has in no sense disavowed by the authoritative voice of its shepherds and teachers is not to attribute heresy to them. Indeed, to be fully in the fellowship of the Church, is to be prepared to grant that there may well be a place in its teaching for the eventual assimilation, in accordance with its mind, of elements in the particular emphasis that dominates the thought of these writers. Since the Church has not warned them of any risk, we appreciate that we are travelling together along the same high road, though on it they prefer, let us say, to take the side from which the Monophysite by-road branches off. We claim no right, therefore save to point out a tendency, and in the direction of that tendency, the possibility of danger.

---

[18] "In Ecclesiae autem membris reapse ii soli annumerandi sunt, qui regenerationis lavacrum receperunt veramque fidem *profitentur*, neque a Corporis compage semet ipsos misere separarunt, vel ob gravissima admissa a legitima auctoritate seiuncti sunt" (*AAS*, XXXV [1943], 202).

[19] Cf. *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église*, p. 71.

This is all the more possible since modern religious thought is often marked, as we have seen, less by dogmatic prepossessions than by a certain sense of the way things feel, an emotional intuition. It is easily possible then, while holding, in word and intention, the Christological formulae of Chalcedon, to see what they are designed to define with an Apollinarist or Monophysite bias.[20]

Thus, according to Father Congar's own evaluation of the situation, the area within which the ecumenicist finds a certain amount of current Catholic teaching and writing to be subject to correction appears to be somewhat difficult to pin down. The men whose works manifest the tendency to which he objects turn out to be walking the path of orthodoxy, even though, "on it they prefer, let us say, to take the side from which the Monophysite by-road branches off."

Now the heresy of the Monophysites consisted precisely in the denial of Our Lord's two distinct natures, the human and the divine.[21] A statement of that heresy would consist in some manner in the assertion that Our Lord had only one nature. A genuine tendency in the direction of the Monophysite error would be found in any statement which would legitimately and logically imply, or leave the way open to the implication, that Our Lord did not have and subsist in a true and perfect human nature and the divine nature itself. Any writers or preachers who manifested such a tendency would definitely not be following the path of Catholic orthodoxy.

Christ, Our Lady and the Church represents Catholic devotion as tending "to think of Jesus Christ as God only."[22] It declares that this tendency is "understandable." It complains, however, that "What is less understandable is that theologians should have failed so frequently to avoid in their presentation a marked tendency to take the Monophysite by-road."[23] Father Congar himself did not make such a serious accusation against theologians as a group. In

[20] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* pp. 43 f.

[21] "Ils [les moines palestiniens] s'obstaient à penser qu'il n'y avait qu'une seule nature, sans vouloir s'expliquer comment la divinité et l'humanité pouvaient no former qu'une seule nature; cette nouvelle doctrine, qui rejetait également et l'eutychianisme et l'enseignement du concile de Chalcedoine, s'appelle proprement le monophysisme par opposition avec l'eutychianisme (Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* II, 857 f.).

[22] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* p. 47.

[23] *Ibid.*

the French original he wrote: "On comprend moins bien que la théologie savante n'évite pas mieux, chez tel ou tel auteur, une présentation des choses qui pourrait la faire glisser vers la pente monophysite."[24]

Father Congar sees two tendencies endangering Catholic thought about the Church itself. "As in Christology, a lack of balance may appear in a Nestorian sense, dividing the Church as Nestorius divided Christ, or in a Monophysite sense through insufficient awareness of the extent of the human element in it."[25] It is the Monophysite tendency that is treated most extensively in *Christ, Our Lady and the Church.* And, Father Congar asserts: "A kind of practical Monophysitism is, on the other hand, the temptation of the devout who are ill instructed and whose piety retains in consequence a certain element of childishness."[26]

At this point Father Congar launches into examples of what he regards as the current tendency towards the *"monophysisme ecclésiologique"* he so deplores. Father St. John translates: "It is possible to preach the divinity of Christ in such terms and with such emphasis that the faithful are puzzled to know how he could be truly man."[27] Where the English translation has "It is possible to preach," the French text has the forthright assertion "Nous prêchons."[28] And, in *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église* itself, we are told that "we preach" about the divine gifts to the Catholic Church in such a way "que les fidèles peu habitués à distinguer dans ce qu'ils admettent de tout leur coeur, voient l'Église comme tout irradiée de sainteté, de force et de certitude divines."[29]

The French text then goes on to complain about the conviction, prevalent even among some of the faithful who are cultivated and fairly well instructed in the content of their faith, to the effect that the papal encyclicals are, *en bloc,* infallible documents. The English translation, on the other hand, offers an explanation of infallible teaching not found at all in Father Congar's own work.

[24] *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* p. 58.
[25] *Christ, our Lady and the Church,* p. 55.
[26] *Ibid.,* p. 56.
[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* p. 68.
[29] *Ibid.,* p. 69. The Apostles' Creed would seem to have succumbed to this tendency, since it speaks of "the holy Catholic Church," without mentioning the "human element" in the Church.

The doctrine of the Church is infallible in its wholeness and in each single truth proclaimed as *de fide*. By infallible doctrine we mean that when the ordinary teaching authority *(magisterium)*, the bishops, in union with the Holy See, dispersed throughout the world, unanimously proclaims a doctrine to be part of that truth which Christ committed to the care of his Church, both the truth itself and the words in which it is embodied as the Church understands and receives them, are immune from error. When the supreme teaching magisterium of the Church, the Bishop of Rome, St. Peter's successor, defines by his personal authority as such, that a truth is contained in the original deposit of Faith, his decision partakes, of itself and not by the subsequent consent of the bishops, in the infallibility with which Christ has endowed his Church.[30]

Here Father St. John has set out to define or to explain what he means by the expression "infallible doctrine." What he has actually done is merely to assert that the bishops of the Catholic Church, united with the Roman Pontiff, teach infallibly when they unanimously proclaim a truth as a dogma of the Catholic faith. The translation makes no reference whatsoever to the secondary object of the Church's infallible teaching power and it fails to take cognizance of the Pope's own ordinary *magisterium*. These omissions are lamentable in a context in which "infallible doctrine" itself is being explained and as it were defined in terms of the primary object. Father St. John's teaching on this point is well within the tradition of doctrinal minimism.

This same tendency is observable in what he has to say about the plenitude of truth in the teaching of the Catholic *magisterium*.

But the Church's current doctrinal teaching on any particular occasion may well be incomplete as to the fullest possible expression of truth. This may be because its formulations, at any given time, may rest upon a limited knowledge of facts, or a degree of development in ideas as yet imperfect and lacking in precision. Even *de fide* definitions, though entirely true and infallible in their positive teaching, do not necessarily exhaust the whole truth, and may well leave room for further clarification. No theologian would deny this, not even those who are concerned to extend to its utmost the scope of the ordinary magisterium of the Church.[31]

[30] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, pp. 57 f.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

The last sentence in the above citation is actually a translation of a statement in *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église.* In the original text, however, it is found in a somewhat different context, since the previous statement in the translation has no counterpart in the French work. But both Father Congar and his translator are oversanguine in their belief that "no theologian would deny" statements of this kind.

Both the original work and the translation have been speaking, in this particular context, of the content of divine public revelation as being taught by the ecclesiastical *magisterium.* Both are quite correct in stating that this teaching is immune from error "in its wholeness *(au total).*"[32] Both lapse into dangerous ambiguity when they write that the Church's current doctrinal teaching may well "be incomplete as to the fullest expression of truth," or, as Father Congar puts it, "N'avoir pas toute sa plénitude de verité."[33]

In point of fact, it is perfectly true that the Church's presentation of the divinely revealed message at any particular time can be said to be lacking in *explicitness* in comparison with that same presentation at a later period in the Church's history. As the Vatican Council has taught us, in the words of St. Vincent of Lerins, the knowledge of individual members of the Church and of the entire Church advances throughout the ages, "sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu eademque sententia."[34] The Church's presentation of God's revelation never lacks the plenitude of truth, even though, at one period, it may teach implicitly a truth which, in later times, it will propose in an explicit manner. There is no excuse for hinting that at any time its current teachings may lack the plenitude of truth.

Both Father Congar and Father St. John are anxious that the faithful should not regard papal encyclicals as infallible documents. Both hold that the faithful "should be taught to look upon successive Encyclicals as efforts made by the Supreme Pastor, under the grace of state that provides guidance for every act undertaken by him in his high and responsible office, to apply, within the actual process of contemporary history, an effective solution to the human

[32] Cf. *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* p. 69.
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] The Constitution *Dei Filius,* c. 4. *Denz.,* 1800.

problems that engage it."[35] They point to what they consider "a danger, exemplified in a certain type of current preaching and in some writings of a quasi-theological character, of giving the impression that before the appearance of an Encyclical the world was in chaos and darkness about the question, but that now a triumphant and piercing light has come from heaven by its means."[36]

* * * * *

Father Congar's book is a clear and thorough application of the principles of one sort of ecumenicist theology, especially to the portion of Catholic teaching dealing with the *magisterium* itself. Under the compulsion of finding a doctrinal area from which Catholics may be called upon to retreat, so that they may match the withdrawal of Father Congar's non-Catholic associates in his "ecumenical dialogue," *Christ, Our Lady and the Church* has attempted to find, in current Catholic teaching, a tendency to a kind of ecclesiological Monophysitism. In attempting to depict this tendency and to describe its presence in contemporary Catholicism, the book has set forth theological teaching which must be considered as highly unsatisfactory from a scientific point of view.

(1) Repeatedly it has pointed to the Church as possessing and as being, in a certain sense, distinguishable in the light of its powers to teach and to sanctify. At the same time it has said nothing about the ecclesiastical power of jurisdiction, given by Our Lord to the Church for the guidance of the faithful, and just as pertinent to the true Church as the other two powers.

(2) It has misinterpreted the old standard definition of the Church, giving it a meaning at variance with true Catholic teaching.

(3) The French original has charged that "we preach" Our Lord's divinity and the gifts with which God has endowed the Church in such a way as to confuse, if not actually to mislead, the faithful.

(4) The English translation has explained the Church's doctrinal infallibility inadequately, particularly in attempting to define it in terms of the primary object alone.

(5) It has claimed that Catholic doctrine can lack its complete plenitude of truth at any given time, and has done this in a context

[35] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, pp. 58 f.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

in which it has been speaking only of the presentation of the revealed message itself.

(6) The one attitude it actually recommends that the faithful adopt toward encyclical letters is to see in them "cet aspect, si réel pourtant et si emouvant, d'effort fait par le Pasteur suprême pour apporter, dans le mouvement même de l'histoire, une réponse valable aux problèmes des hommes."[37]

(7) It has drawn an odious caricature, and has said that it describes what is set forth "in a certain type of current preaching and in some writings of a quasi-theological character."

Oddly enough, in the conclusion of the second chapter of this work, Father Congar draws a picture of a kind of defective theology, which he chooses to designate as "spiritual theology."

> It deals, as does any other theology, with the Holy Spirit, with Christ, with our Lady, with grace and with suffering. But in so doing it does not set out primarily to seek for an objective view, using its sources in accordance with the certitude they carry and the relevancy of their application. Nor does it aim at limiting various aspects of the mystery under consideration to their due proportions within the whole. Its object is rather to give the greatest possible weight to a particular aspect of the mystery because it has been the basis of a religious experience of a specially vital kind.[38]

It is in terms of this "spiritual theology" that Father Congar sets out to explain, among other things, "A certain number of errors or clumsy phrases in M. Olier, if they may be called such." And, he asserts, "It would not be difficult to show, in the same way, that the ecclesiological developments of which we have quoted some examples are chiefly maintained by a *devotion* to the Church, and by a personal devotion to the Pope, which owes its origin to the sympathy and affection which the heavy responsibility of the pontificate engenders." The "ecclesiological developments" of which Father Congar speaks and which he deplores consist in what he regards as an excessive weight given to the teachings of the papal encyclicals.

Christ, Our Lady and the Church never alludes to the fact that the doctrinal decisions and teachings of the papal encyclicals

[37] *Le Christ, Marie et l'Église,* pp. 69 f.
[38] *Christ, Our Lady and the Church,* p. 78.

must be accepted by all Christians with at least a firm and inward religious assent. The abundant theological literature on the doctrinal authority of these encyclicals is always quite clear on this point. It is both inaccurate and unjust to speak of such literature as "chiefly maintained" by a devotion to the Church and by a personal devotion to the Sovereign Pontiff (Pope Pius IX, according to Father Congar, and apparently Pope Pius XII, according to Father St. John). This current theological literature on the encyclicals aims, and for the most part aims successfully, to set forth correctly and clearly the response that the faithful must give to these instructions from the successor of St. Peter.

Father Congar's description of "spiritual theology" does not completely fit ecumenicist theology. In one respect, however, the description is most accurate. By its very nature, the type of writing found in *Christ, Our Lady and the Church* is not ordered to an objective presentation of fact. It is inherently a part of a process which looks primarily to the continuance of "ecumenical dialogues" in which, apparently, these ecumenicists find "a religious experience of a specially vital kind."

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

A CHAPLAIN AND HIS CRITIC

Question: An editorial in a recent issue of a popular Catholic magazine has named and sharply rebuked a priest who serves as chaplain for the Catholic students of a secular university. The editorial writer agreed with his brother-priest's complaint that "students are robbed of God by the theory that God is only a symbol." He was displeased, however, by the chaplain's warning that "America has much to fear from the mentality of its teachers—more so than from the nihilism of Khrushchev and the others of the Soviet."

The author of the editorial classified the chaplain's statement in the category of "verbal broadsides" and "emotionally charged accusations." He insisted that statements such as that made by the chaplain will bring about "the erection of a wall of resentment on the part of many of the professors and students" and tend to diminish or destroy our influence with those professors "who are teaching doctrines and theories that are contrary to our theological and philosophical positions."

In the present situation of Catholics in the United States, are statements such as those attributed to the chaplain really objectionable?

Answer: The editorial to which our questioner refers says that there have been several other "forcefully worded statements" by the chaplain, and claims that these "have received widespread publicity." The writer of the editorial, however, does not cite or even refer explicitly to any statement by the chaplain except the two quoted in our questioner's letter. With one of these the author of the editorial says he "can agree." Hence it would appear that the chaplain's main offense consisted in asserting publicly that America had more to fear from the mentality of some of its teachers than from the nihilism of the Russian leaders. The text of the editorial itself confirms this conclusion. We read that: "Calling them [the

teachers who work to inculcate atheism in their students] more dangerous than the Red leaders of Russia will not change their teaching; nor will it—except in the most extreme case—cause the university administrators to put restrictions on them."

We are concerned here, then, with the chaplain's statement that "America has much to fear from the mentality of its teachers—more so than from the nihilism of Khrushchev and the others of the Soviet." One question is: would it have been better not to have made this statement publicly? One may also ask if the editorial writer was justified in rebuking the chaplain as he did.

A published statement is open to adverse criticism if it is untrue or if it is dangerously misleading. The statement attributed to the chaplain is perfectly and demonstrably accurate, and is not in the least ambiguous. On this score there can be no objectively justifiable protest of complaint against it.

Even a true published statement is objectively reprehensible if it violates the norms of justice or of charity. There is no trace of any such offense in the statement attributed to the chaplain. It is a matter of common knowledge that there are a great many teachers in the United States who, in their lectures and in their writings, attempt to delude students into imagining that the one true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, does not exist. It is manifestly true that the young people who are thus deceived have been grievously harmed by these teachers. And, since such harm done to its citizens constitutes a serious injury to the state itself, it is rather obvious that our country has a great deal to fear from the mentality of men who are striving to influence Americans to become atheists. The harm these men can do is considerably worse than anything the present leaders of the Kremlin are capable of accomplishing, since, apparently Mr. Khrushchev and his friends do not exercise a great deal of direct influence on our people.

Finally, even a true statement which is neither unjust nor uncharitable is legitimately open to published adverse criticism if it is imprudent. It is on this ground that the editorial criticizes the chaplain's statement.

The editorial attacks the chaplain's statement on the grounds that it tends to build up "a wall of resentment," that it will not change the lectures and writings of the professors whose teaching the chaplain described as dangerous to our country, that it will

not cause university administrators to impose restrictions on these professors, and that it does not tend to "win the understanding and sympathy which are the groundwork for a positive influence," presumably on these same professors.

If the chaplain's statement had no orientation or effect other than to arouse resentment, it certainly would have been imprudent. If the harm that it did in the area of public relations completely outweighed any beneficial result it might have accomplished, it would also have been legitimately subject to adverse criticism. Definitely and certainly, however, the statement attributed to the chaplain was not characterized by any such imprudence.

Of course there were bad effects which followed from the publication of the chaplain's statement, effects which the chaplain must have foreseen very clearly. It did build up a wall of resentment directed primarily against himself. Quite probably it tended to lessen or to destroy any possibility that the chaplain could exercise positive influence over the professors who are trying to make atheists of their students.

There were good effects also. The chaplain's statement tended to alert Americans who acknowledge the fact of God's existence to the fearful harm being done in some sections of the academic field. It prevented that triumph so intensely desired by teachers who use their influence in favor of error, the triumph that comes to them when the guardians of truth allow the error to go unchallenged.

The good effects are far more important than any undesirable results that might have come from the chaplain's statement. As it stands, the editorial writer had no legitimate grounds for adversely criticizing it at all.

The editorial directed against the chaplain's statement was unfortunate even from other points of view. It offends against justice and against charity by representing this priest as issuing "verbal broadsides" and as using "emotionally charged arguments." It implies that he is not "prepared to discuss difficulties and problems in a calm, intelligent manner." It offers no evidence whatsoever to justify or even to explain what can only be considered as an extraordinarily antagonistic attitude on the part of a Catholic editor towards a priest in good standing, whose main offense seems to have been his open opposition to atheistic teaching.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THE SUPPRESSED OCTAVE OF CORPUS CHRISTI

Question: How are the days following the feast of Corpus Christi affected with the new regulations concerning the liturgy? What precisely I have in mind are two difficulties. Our Sisters formerly had the privilege of Benediction each day during this octave and now they requested it on the feast itself and on the octave day. For myself I wonder about the addition of "Alleluia" to the "Panem de coelo etc." from the feast of Corpus Christi up to the feast of the Sacred Heart.

Answer: We read in the instruction of March 23, 1955, that all octaves are suppressed except the octaves of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost whether they occur in the universal calendar or in particular calendars. Father Bugnini *(The Simplification of the Rubrics)* adds this comment: "Out of the 17 octaves of the calendar of the universal Church, only three have been retained with full celebration. All the rest, as well as the five of particular calendars, have been discontinued."

This being the case, there would be no justification for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on the octave day of Corpus Christi, since the octave no longer exists. Likewise, we were instructed to add "Alleluia" to the Benediction versicle on the feast of Corpus Christi and during its octave. Since the octave ceases, there is no reason whatsoever to add anything to the versicle "Panem de coelo."

THE PROPER PREFACE

Question: Recently, there was a discussion among some of the priests about the correct preface to be said. How are we to know what preface is proper? When do we use the common preface?

Answer: We are to say the preface which is proper to each Mass and if there is no proper one, then the preface of the season is said or the common preface.

Again Father Bugnini comments "it may be noted that the 'propriety' must be understood in the strict sense ("proper" and not

"appropriated"). Therefore the feast of Corpus Christi and that of the Transfiguration, not having a proper preface (the preface of Christmas was appropriated), take the common one; and the Masses of the Popes no longer appropriate the preface of the Apostles." Hence, we should follow the directions in the ordo and not those of the Missal, since it is not brought up to date. Thus the Votive Mass of the Priesthood of Our Lord directs us to say the preface of the cross, whereas it should be the common preface or the preface of the season.

RECITATION OF PRAYERS BEFORE MASS

Question: Is it permissible to say the prayers while vesting for Mass in English? My first impression would be to answer affirmatively since these prayers are not binding under pain of sin and since the priest says these prayers to himself, an altar boy or lay person in the vicinity would not be scandalized if the prayers were recited in English. I have examined various authors on this point and I cannot find an answer. The only argument I could imagine would be from tradition of the church which bears great weight, but since the prayers are not obligatory it would seem reasonable and convenient to recite them in English since the Latin is usually "swallowed" and an attempt is made to say them as quickly as possible.

Answer: The *Ritus* as well as the Missal prescribe these vesting prayers. As a matter of fact the Missal says about the vesting prayers: "orationes dicendae." If they are only directive and not preceptive why are not the words "pro opportunitate" added? If these prayers are prescribed to be said by priests while they are vesting for Mass, certainly if there is a choice of the language in which they can be said, why is it not stated? We see absolutely no reason or justification for reciting these prayers in the vernacular. If one wishes to recite them in English to himself before he vests that is a matter of personal concern. As for "swallowing" the Latin, most churches have vesting cards in the sacristy, which should help any priest to concentrate on the vesting prayers at the proper time.

NUMBER OF CANDLES REQUIRED

Question: We always light six candles for a Missa Cantata on weekdays or Sunday. A visiting priest recently remarked that only four candles were necessary for a High Mass. What is the common practice?

Answer: The various authors direct that at least four candles must be lighted for a High Mass. Father Sadlowski (*Sacred Furnishings of Churches)* says "for sung Masses the ordinary practice, at least in the United States, is to light six candles. The liturgical writers generally advise that six candles are to be used at least on the more solemn days and on special occasions, and at least four on other days. The Decrees of the Sacred Congregation contain very few regulations regarding the number of candles to be used for sung Masses. One decree allows the lighting of more candles on feast days."

NYLON SURPLICES

Question: Would you kindly tell me if nylon surplices are permitted to be worn for liturgical services?

Answer: Most of the authors describe the surplice as a linen vestment, a modification of the alb. As a liturgical vestment it dates back to the eleventh century. Giving it at the conferral of first tonsure dates from the fourteenth century. Before the sixteenth century the surplice was generally plain but after this time lace trimmings appeared and later surplices appeared made entirely of lace.

As for nylon the Congregation of Rites has made no statement or ruling regarding ecclesiastical vestments made of nylon. Father Sadlowski states that "until a decree is forthcoming, it appears to be illicit to use this material (nylon) for vestments, even though it is generally regarded to have the same appearance, texture, and value of silk." We might say the same for surplices since they are regarded as ecclesiastical vestments.

DEDICATION OF A CHURCH

Question: Sunday, September 1, 1957, we will dedicate our new church in honor of St. Cecilia. A solemn Mass will follow the solemn dedication ceremony or blessing of the church. What Mass do we offer, the Mass of the Sunday or the Mass of the feast?

Answer: The Mass in honor of St. Cecilia is to be offered on the occasion of the solemn dedication of your church, with a commemoration of the Sunday, preface of the Trinity and the last gospel of St. John.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

ATTENDANCE AT BILLY GRAHAM'S SERVICES

Question: Is a Catholic permitted to attend the "crusade" services conducted by the Evangelist, Billy Graham? Some Catholics seem to have the idea that his talks are merely lectures, containing doctrines beneficial to all, so that Catholics may attend without violating any law.

Answer: The answer to this question was given in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for July, 1955 (p. 53), but in view of the aroused interest in Mr. Graham recently throughout our land, it may be profitable to repeat the substance of this reply. No doubt, Mr. Graham is a good and sincere man, and some of the doctrines he preaches are solid Christian truth. Nevertheless, the doctrinal system he upholds is erroneous. He proposes the Bible alone as the norm of Christian truth, he omits in his instructions such essential truths as the real presence of Our Lord in the Holy Eucharist and the necessity of affiliation in the Church of Christ as a means of salvation, he seems to accept the notion that it makes no difference what particular form of religion a person may accept. Hence, his services are based on essentially Protestant doctrine, and accordingly Catholics are forbidden to participate in them. To take active part in these services—for example, by singing or praying in conjunction with the Evangelist—would be active communication, something intrinsically and gravely wrong. To participate in these services passively—that is, merely by being present—would not be intrinsically wrong, but would be forbidden by the

law of the Church, which prohibits even passive presence without a grave reason (Can. 1258). Surely, it is difficult to imagine a reason that will justify a Catholic in attending the "crusade" services of Billy Graham. Mere curiosity would not justify such attendance. However, one who would attend a non-Catholic service out of curiosity on an individual occasion without any danger of scandal or of perversion would probably be guilty of only a venial sin (Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis,* I, n. 758).

AN INHERITANCE FOR MASSES

Question: A sum of money was left in a will for Masses, but without specification of the number that the testator wished. However, the deceased person, in the course of her lifetime, was accustomed to have "announced Masses" said regularly, giving the additional stipend expected for these. In view of this fact, may "announced Masses" be said for the legacy at this same higher stipend?

Answer: Canon 830 prescribes that if a sum of money is given for Masses without any indication as to the number of Masses the donor wishes, the number is to be computed according to the stipend prevailing in the place where the donor lived "unless it must be lawfully presumed that his intention was different." In the case described by the questioner it can be reasonably presumed that the testator intended the stipends for the Masses to be reckoned according to the custom she followed during her lifetime—that is, "announced Masses" may be said, according to the stipend which the faithful are accustomed to give for them.

HOLY COMMUNION FOR THE NURSE

Question: When a priest brings Holy Communion to a sick person, may he, on the same occasion, administer the Holy Eucharist to the nurse or relative who is taking care of the patient and who finds it impossible to go to the church for Holy Communion?

Answer: On July 29, 1927, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, in reply to the question whether on the occasion of the administration of Holy Communion to a sick person those liv-

ing in the house of the sick person may also receive the Blessed Sacrament, answered in the affirmative, "provided the Ordinary of the place grants the faculty according to the provision cited, namely for each case and by way of act" (Cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest* I, p. 391). In an instruction of the Secretary of the Congregation annexed to this response it was stated that the Ordinary may delegate this faculty to others, though he should be very careful to concede it only to priests who are sufficiently prudent not to abuse this extraordinary privilege. For it must be remembered that it is a general law that, outside of the administration of Holy Communion to the sick, the Blessed Eucharist may be received only in places where Mass may be celebrated (Can. 869). Hence, even if a priest has received from his Ordinary the right to give Holy Communion to persons who are not ill on the occasion of Holy Communion to the sick, he should use it with great discretion. Certainly, if a priest is accustomed to bring Holy Communion to a sick woman two or three times a week, it would seem to be an abuse of the faculty in question to give Holy Communion on each occasion to her nurse or her daughter, just because this latter cannot get to church that day. But I believe the faculty could be used for the same person once a month—for example, on the First Friday. Furthermore, I believe that even a priest who has not received the required permission or delegation from the Ordinary might, by a reasonable use of *epicheia,* give Holy Communion in such circumstances to one who is not sick, when he finds out about a situation justifying the exception only on his arrival.

The following statement of Father Sheehan in his doctoral dissertation, *The Administration of Holy Communion* (Catholic University of America Press, 1950, p. 150), is pertinent to this case. It must be remembered that he is presuming that the permission of the local Ordinary or of his delegate has already been given for the administration of Holy Communion to one who is not ill, and he is concerned only with the place of administration. "Holy Communion should not be given in a bedroom, except to the sick. However, when in an exceptional case the one who cares for the sick person cannot leave him to go to an oratory or to some other becoming place, *epikeia* can warrant the distribution of Communion to the attendant in the bedroom of the sick person."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

PIO XI VISTO DA VICINO. By Carlo Confalonieri. Torino: Editrice S.A.I.E., 1957. Pp. 416. 1000 lire.

Archbishop Confalonieri is the brilliant secretary of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities. This year, which marks the hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great Pontiff who preceded Pope Pius XII in the Chair of St. Peter, he has given us a uniquely valuable book about Pope Pius XI.

No one could be better qualified than Archbishop Confalonieri for the writing of such a book. When Achille Ratti, in 1921, was appointed Archbishop of Milan and Cardinal, Carlo Confalonieri was one of the two young priests chosen by the future Pope as his confidential secretaries. The other was Archbishop Diego Venini, now the present Holy Father's Secret Almoner. The two young priests accompanied Cardinal Ratti to Rome, where he received the Red Hat. They followed him to Lourdes, to which he led an Italian pilgrimage that same year. They were with him when he took possession of his Cathedral, the famous Duomo of Milan.

Father Confalonieri acted as Cardinal Ratti's secretary during the 1922 conclave. After Cardinal Ratti's elevation to the Supreme Pontificate, his two young secretaries continued to serve him until the end of his reign.

Pio XI Visto da Vicino is not, properly speaking, a biography of Pope Pius XI. It is rather the clear and magnificently enlightening expression of which his confidential secretary learned about him during the historic years of their intimate association. As such, it gives us an insight into the intellectual and spiritual characteristics of the Pontiff who ruled as chief shepherd over the true Church of Jesus Christ during the tumultuous and historic years between the two world wars.

The book tells us of the accomplishments of Pius XI. It recounts the encyclicals he wrote, the building program he conceived and carried out, and the advances in the direction of the universal Church. It throws a valuable light on such topics as the foundation of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, the triumphant settlement of the Roman question, and the 1931 conflict between the Church and the civil government in Italy. There are especially valuable pages dealing with the last illness and the death of Pope Pius XI.

Most valuable of all is the picture of the temperament and the basic attitude of the great Pope. Archbishop Confalonieri shows us his strong will, his cultured mind, his powerful and as it were instinctive gratitude and generosity. Through his eyes we realize the seriousness with which Pius XI regarded his high and terrible responsibility to Our Lord. And, as the ultimate basis for all of his attitudes and activity, we encounter his solid and intense charity for Our Lord.

Some have remarked that *Pio XI Visto da Vicino* makes a hero of its subject. It would be more proper to say that it represents him as he was. The heroic stature of Pius XI is in no way due to books or articles about him. It was rather God's gift to him, and to the Church he governed, as Our Lord's Vicar on earth, during the stirring years between the wars.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THE CATHOLIC PRIEST IN THE MODERN WORLD. By James A. Magner. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1957. Pp. 291. $4.75.

Almost a half century ago Arthur Barry O'Neill began a series of articles on the Priesthood in this very review which subsequently were published in three volumes, *Sacerdotal Safeguards, Priestly Practice,* and *Clerical Colloquies.* They were modern spiritual and practical approaches to the problems and the difficulties and the methods that confronted the Catholic Priest in the Modern World of the first two decades of the Twentieth Century. They still make good reading today and an excellent source of meditation and examination of conscience for the principles laid down there are eternal and unchanging and they can be applied to a Modern World that knows golf, radio, television, jet planes, and atomic power. The world is continually in a tumult of change and each succeeding age is modern, but basic principles do not vary. They are always modern and can be applied to any set of external circumstances.

We mention the above because we fear some may approach this latest and most modern study of the Catholic Priesthood hoping to find new principles, new directives, or even new objectives for the priest. Obviously, they won't be here because moral and spiritual values do not change and the age-old principles are just going to be applied to the phenomena of the world that we call modern and which historians a quarter of a century hence will be referring to as the "Atomic Age."

Out of a wealth of experience, the author of this study first of all brings to his fellow priests and to the laity some of the fundamentals

that should be in the life of every true priest. Because priests are persons living in a personable world and, by their very calling, seeking to lead other persons to the Three Supreme Persons—the Blessed Trinity—quite logically the author initiates his study with the personality of the priest. Some may think that the second chapter should have been the opening introduction to this very important work. But, without minimizing in any way the absolute need for true sanctity and deep spirituality in a priest, the author shows that the effectiveness of this personal sanctity and spirituality to the society that the priest must lead to God is, in a great measure, dependent on how he shows forth his personal sanctity, his spirituality, his learning, his humaneness, and above all his Christlike love of humanity, to the world in which he moves.

Once he has established the link between spirituality and personality, Dr. Magner in a charming easy to read style proceeds to the application of age-old principles to the position of a priest in this Modern World by examining the cultural and social life of the priest, his home, his handling of personal and parochial finances. In all of these chapters the author very skilfully keeps harkening back to the chapter on the spiritual life of the priest. In fact this is the golden thread that weaves in and out of every chapter, making it a complete tapestry.

No phase of priestly activity is overlooked. The value of the Sunday Sermon and of a care for the Liturgy are emphasized by devoting a complete chapter to each. This world of stress and strain with consequent neurotic nuances calls for more than a kind word and a pat on the back. The priest today should be well versed in psychology and even a minimum of psychiatry and, if he finds himself unable to solve cases of this nature, he should refer these troubled souls to competent counselors.

Every phase of parish work, social action and education is examined as it affects the priest of today. The Missionary endeavors at home and abroad are examined and some may find it disconcerting to know that there is a Mission field starting across the street or a block away from the parochial buildings.

This book will make an ideal source of meditation, reflection, and serious mental prayer for every priest. From it, we think, will come much action which we are certain was in the author's mind. It will be a mine of information and edification to the laity and we hope many of them will come to know it and, through knowing it, know the Priesthood better.

THOMAS A. MEEHAN

A WOMAN OF UNITY. By Sister Mary Celine, S.A. Foreword by Archbishop Cushing. Peekskill, N. Y.: Graymoor Press, 1956. Pp. xv + 357. $4.50.

In 1951 the biography of Fr. Paul James Francis, S.A., appeared under the title, *Father Paul of Graymoor*. It was written by David Gannon, S.A. Since then it has been devoutedly desired that a companion volume be written on Mother Lurana Mary Francis, S.A., the Co-Founder of the Society of the Atonement, and close associate with Father Paul in his work for reunion and in other spiritual enterprises. This second volume has now been written by Sister Mary Celine, S.A., Vicaress of the Atonement Sisters at Graymoor.

The story of Mother Lurana is a record of the remarkable workings of divine grace in the human soul. When she was born in 1870 in New York City of non-Catholic parents, who could have foretold that Archbishop Cushing would say of her: ". . . Lurana Mary White became a religious by divine vocation long before her religious profession was ratified by the Church. Eleven years were to pass between the day she took her vows privately before Father Paul Francis and the day of formal profession following her conversion. . . . During the quarter of a century of ceaseless activity Mother Lurana fulfilled the mission which God had entrusted to her. When she died in 1935, five years before the death of Father Paul Francis, she could stand before the heavenly Bridegroom, her lamps lighted in the oil of a magnificent apostolate" (xii).

Mother Lurana was associated with Father Paul in the foundation and the formation of the Society of the Atonement at Graymoor in a way similar to other noble personages in the history of the Church—like St. Clare with St. Francis, or St. Scholastica with St. Benedict, or St. Jane Frances de Chantal with St. Francis de Sales. Mother Lurana was his companion, confidant, and adviser in all projects and shared with him the joys, sorrows, worries and triumphs. She entered the Catholic Church on October 30, 1909, with Father Paul and their associates. At the time her community of Sisters numbered five members. Today they are a congregation of 350 Sisters, represented in 30 dioceses in the United States and Canada—in Ireland, in Assisi, Rome, and Quadrelli in Italy—and they hope to make a foundation in Japan in the fall. At the present time the Sisters are engaged in catechetical and social work, in retreat work for women, and in the promotion of the Unity apostolate in various ways.

Nearly every founder and foundress is endowed with unusual graces, and in God's dealings with Mother Lurana there was no exception. She had a keen appreciation of religious life, a deep insight into the

Franciscan spirit, and an extraordinary love for the apostolate of Unity. It was in this last aspect of her life that she stands out so remarkably.

Mother Lurana did not institute conferences or lead discussions for reunion. She did not lead pilgrimages to famous shrines for the cause of Unity; she did not write informative and persuasive treatises on this great problem of the present time. Her apostolate was one of prayer, of sacrifice, of love for the Church and loyalty to the Pope. She instilled these same qualities of mind and heart into her daughters. Her Unity apostolate has been very effective.

This modern Clare was nearly forty years of age when she entered the Catholic Church. But even before this eventful day she wrote of Unity: "The lack of real desire for a return of the Anglican Church to reunion with the Holy See has heretofore been on our own part, and not on the part of the occupants of the Chair of St. Peter. . . . If every parish must have its rector, and every diocese its bishop, how could the whole Catholic Church throughout the world exist as one fold without having one supreme or chief shepherd over all?" Her deep understanding of her own vocation of Unity and that of the Society of the Atonement grew with the years.

"The reunion of Christendom is our unique aim," she explained to her Sisters. "We like to separate our name and think of its syllables, At-one-ment, meaning to make at-one. This is therefore very evidently our special vocation, the one for which God called our Society into being. And this is what Rome expects of the Society of the Atonement. We know how our late Holy Father Pope Pius X had hoped that this Society would do much for Unity. . ." (317). On another occasion she dwelt on the excellence of the religious calling: ". . . how great a vocation is ours, nothing less than to help answer Our Lord's prayer at the Last Supper, 'that they all may be One.' When we love anyone very much we pay great attention to the dying request which they make and we may look on this as Our Lord's dying request. How great a privilege is ours! . . . We have our Franciscan tradition in this great work. . . . St. Francis is still interested [in Unity] and expects his youngest child, our Institute, to do all in its power to give impetus to the reunion of Christendom" (318).

Thus Mother Lurana was a worthy companion with Father Paul in the establishment of the Society of the Atonement. She was worthy too of the Unity vocation to which they pledged themselves and their communities. Her story is the wonderful adventure of God's grace in leading her from a religious body outside the Church into the One Fold, and of giving the opportunities and the grace through which her own ideals might be realized and blessed.

This saintly soul shared with Father Paul—and indeed helped to inspire in him as well—a great love for the Franciscan mode of life, a singular appreciation of the mystery of the Atonement and of the work of At-one-ment, and also a special devotion to Mary whom they honored with the new and distinctive title of Our Lady of Atonement. Mother Lurana helped to compose the Office and Mass for the feast of Our Lady of the Atonement. She conceived the name for the Chair of Unity Octave, annually observed throughout the Church each January 18-26, when Cardinal Bourne of Westminster in 1926 asked Father Paul for an alternate title to supplant the original name, Church Unity Octave.

Mother Lurana takes her place in American Franciscans as one who has contributed much to the glory of the Order of Francis in the United States. She rightfully assumes her position with other noble women of the Church in this nation, with Mother Seton and her Sisters of Charity; with Mother Joseph and her Maryknoll Sisters; with Mother Theodore and the Sisters of Providence.

This biography and study is a welcome addition to lives of noteworthy Franciscans in our country and of great persons interested in the work of Christian Unity. Sister Mary Celine is to be congratulated on this splendid narration and appraisal of the career and of the personality of her foundress.

TITUS CRANNY, S.A.

MENTAL HEALTH IN CHILDHOOD. By Charles L. C. Burns. Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956. Pp. x + 86. $2.75.

Dr. Burns is the Senior Psychiatrist to the Birmingham Child Guidance Service in England. He says in the Preface that his book is written by a Catholic, and addressed to some extent to his fellow Catholics. Both as a parent and as an experienced child psychiatrist he is concerned about the lack of understanding of many parents with regard to their children. Some parents are too "tough" and others too "tender." The author is more worried about the attitude of the former than of the latter. As for the "tough" he feels that "there is danger in too much rectitude, in that kind of cold 'charity' which finds it necessary to force children to be good, to be obedient, to be religious; with no real understanding, no warmth, no sympathy." The author believes that there is no longer reason for such misunderstanding, because "we now possess a body of knowledge and experience in the psychology of childhood which is profoundly and inevitably affecting our views on upbringing, education and treatment of children." He summarizes the

correct attitude of parents as regards the upbringing of children in this manner: "Given that we provide them with the right kind of emotional climate—as far from worry and fuss, as 'relaxed' as possible—our proper task is to watch them with loving observation, and learn from them what they need for their unfolding. It is by enjoying them in this way that we promote their mental welfare, not by reading books about psychology and becoming anxious."

Illustrating his point with case histories, the author cites as examples of maladjusted children the jealous, instable, and deprived. Especially the orphaned, abandoned and neglected children become maladjusted. But for the most urgent reasons, children should not be taken away from home. The author agrees, within limits, with the slogan: a bad parent is better than no parent. But he is quick to add that these bad and stupid parents should be trained.

Burns sketches the personality development in childhood somewhat along along Freudian lines. He holds that the Oedipus complex occurs more frequently than is believed, and he subscribes also to the notion of infantile sexuality. Since sex education is of a paramount importance, the author presents some sound counseling in this delicate matter.

Among the causes of juvenile delinquency the author mentions those that are usually reported, such as unhappy and broken homes, the real or imaginary feeling of children that they are not wanted, separation from home for long periods. But he adds that inborn, inherited, congenital factors also play a role. As for treatment he suggests "that to advocate repressive discipline as a means of curing the majority of real delinquents is not only injust but stupid. Most of these children have been deprived of human affection and of understanding; they need more of it, not less."

In general, the treatment of maladjusted children falls into two patterns, according to the author. Probably about one in ten will require to be sent away from home for residential treatment. They are children who have proved refractory to other methods of handling, at home or at school; or those whose homes are too bad, from the emotional rather than the material aspect. For the remaining ninety per cent Dr. Burns advises home and school treatment, with the assistance of a Child Guidance Clinic. One of the chapters describes the usual composition of such a clinic; a psychologist, a psychiatrist and a social worker.

Dr. Burns' little book contains nothing startling; all this has been said before. It presents, in condensed form, a great deal of solid and practical advice for both the "tough" and the "tender" parent or educator.

JAMES VAN DER VELDT, O.F.M.

SOBRIETY AND BEYOND. By Father John Doe. Indianapolis: Sobriety and Beyond, Inc., P.O. Box 1194, 1955. Pp. 412. $3.95.

SOBRIETY WITHOUT END. By Father John Doe. Indianapolis: The SMT Guild, P.O. Box 1194, 1957. Pp. 364. $3.95.

These two books by the same author, a Catholic priest who prefers the pen name of "John Doe," are compilations of talks which he gave over a period of ten years to groups of the Alcoholics Anonymous. The significance of the titles is explained at the beginning of each book. Alcoholics who conquer their craving for intoxicating liquor will not only achieve sobriety but will go beyond it to peace of mind and contentment. And the author hopes that those who practice the lessons proposed in his writings will continue their sobriety to the end of their lives, so that their sobriety will be truly sobriety without end.

Father John Doe frankly confesses that he is an alcoholic; but he is one of the many thousands who have solved their problem with the aid of the Alcoholics Anonymous. His ambition is to extend to others the benefits he has derived from association with this organization and from the practice of its principles and procedures.

The author begins his first book with a definition of "an alcoholic." He cites and rejects such definitions as "an individual who drinks alone," and "an individual who drinks in the morning," and accepts as the best definition "one who having taken one drink cannot guarantee his behavior." He insists emphatically that once a person is an alcoholic, he is always an alcoholic, and consequently must be a total abstainer.

The writer frequently recurs to the Twelve Steps that form the basic principles of the Alcoholics Anonymous, explaining and recommending them at great length, and pointing out how readily they lend themselves to the teachings of Catholic spirituality. Topics pertinent to the main theme, such as the need of humility and honesty on the part of the alcoholic, sobriety and sex, the efficacy of prayer, etc., are also well developed in harmony with Catholic principles. In his second book Father John Doe has a lengthy and excellent commentary on the Lord's Prayer. However, I would not agree with his statement (p. 314, note) that "any Catholic may use it [the doxology, usual among Protestants, "for thine is the kingdom, etc."] to close the Lord's Prayer in private or in a public meeting which is non-religious." For Catholics of the Latin rite the Church prescribes the Our Father as it is found in the Latin Mass, without the aforesaid doxolgy.

These books should prove a source of great inspiration and helpful guidance to persons afflicted with the unfortunate psysiological and psychological condition known as alcoholism. Priests whose assistance